



BS 1171 .W42 1896
Weidner, Revere Franklin,
1851-1915.
Biblical theology of the Old
Testament

BIBLICAL THEOLOGY

OF THE

OLD TESTAMENT

BASED ON OEHLER.

BY

REVERE FRANKLIN WEIDNER, D. D., LL. D.

*Professor of Dogmatic Theology in the Chicago Lutheran Theological Seminary;
Author of "Studies in the Book", "Commentary on Mark", "Biblical
Theology of the New Testament", "Theological Encyclopædia",
"An Introduction to Dogmatic Theology", "New Testament
Greek Method", "Christian Ethics", etc.*

SECOND EDITION, REVISED AND ENLARGED.

FLEMING H. REVELL CO.,
NEW YORK. CHICAGO. TORONTO.

5598

COPYRIGHT 1896,
BY
REVERE FRANKLIN WEIDNER.

PREFACE TO THE FIRST EDITION.

Biblical Theology is one of the more recent branches of Theology. Our older theologians did not distinguish between Dogmatic and Biblical Theology. During the whole development of Church doctrine down to the middle of the present century, no distinct line was drawn between the essential contents of revelation as they are laid down in the Scriptures and the doctrinal formulas elaborated from them; and still less were the successive stages of revelation and the types of doctrine which are presented in Scripture, recognized. The Bible was supposed to attest equally, in the Old and New Testaments, the truths which the Church has accepted as doctrines,—the Old Testament being used in all its parts, just like the New Testament, for proofs of doctrine.

But our modern theologians maintain that the Old and New Testament stand to each other in the relation of preparation and fulfilment,—that their *unity* must not be understood as *identity*,—that the Old Testament itself acknowledges that the manifestation of God's kingdom at that time was imperfect and temporary,—that still more distinctly does the New Testament emphasize the difference from the Old which subsists within the unity of the two Testaments,—

that the eternal counsel of salvation, although announced by the prophets, is nevertheless not completely revealed till after its actual realization,—that the tuition of the law reached its goal in the grace and truth of Christ,—that the unity of the Old and New Testament must not be conceived of as an identity of doctrine, but as a gradually advancing process of development of doctrine,—that in setting forth the doctrines of the Bible systematically we must recognize the general development which revelation passes through in Scripture itself,—and that the old atomistic system of Scripture proof must be superseded by one which shows that the truths of salvation formulated in doctrinal statements are the result of the whole process through which revelation has passed.

We distinguish, therefore, between Biblical Theology and Systematic Theology. For Christian Dogmatics or Systematic Theology is a historico-philosophical science, in which the results of historical exegesis are unified and systematized. It is the sum of the truths embraced in the Christian faith in their organic connection with the facts of religious consciousness. Biblical Theology, on the other hand, has for its aim to represent the religious ideas and doctrines which are contained in the Bible, and is a purely historical discipline. Systematic Theology takes the results of Biblical Theology for granted, and works with them as its material. Some even go so far as to distinguish between Biblical Theology and Biblical Dogmatics, in

which the former has to do with the variety of biblical forms of teaching, and the latter with the examination of the doctrines and ideas of the sacred writers which Biblical Theology brings out and with their presentation in a systematic form. According to this view, Christian Dogmatics or Systematic Theology must be based upon Biblical Dogmatics, which again must be based upon the results of Biblical Theology.

Of late Systematic Theology has been somewhat neglected in certain parts of the Protestant world, and indeed has fallen into disrepute, more stress being laid upon the results of Biblical Theology. We are told that in Systematic Theology we have the deductions and speculations of men while in Biblical Theology we have the pure teaching of the Word of God. But let us not forget that the man who takes up the Bible now without reference to what has been done towards its elucidation in the past, and without being guided by the development of doctrine, is exactly as foolish as the man who would undertake to take up any branch of science without regard to what has been done before.

Biblical Theology naturally divides itself into that of the Old Testament and that of the New, and there is no discipline of theological science which is more important, and on which more depends. Our aim, in this work, is to present in a concise and still full form the Theology of the Old Testament. No one can present such a theology in its fullness and scientific preci-

sion unless he has repeatedly gone over all the Books of the Old Testament with this special object in view. It implies a critical and exegetical study of the Hebrew original, and the results of such close exegetical study would only take their proper shape after years of study. Though the writer for the last twelve years has paid especial attention to the study of the Hebrew Scriptures, and has studied in course, all the books of the Old Testament, and has had the great privilege of lecturing on the most important of them during the last four years to his theological classes, and has during all this time been accumulating material, still when the question arose of presenting the Theology of the Old Testament in a scientific form, the writer deemed it best to rewrite the work of the Master of this branch of Theology, hoping in this way to contribute most to a more exact knowledge of the doctrines of the Old Testament.

Since the first appearance of "*The Theology of the Old Testament*" by *Gustav Friedrich Oehler* in 1873, it has deservedly been regarded as the most important work on this subject, and it is a question whether it ever will be superseded. The author had especial gifts and qualifications for this branch of theology, and his rank as an expositor of the Old Testament is very high. For thirty years he lectured on this subject, and almost every topic presented in his system has been most elaborately treated by him in the first edition of Herzog's *Real-Encyklopædie* (1854-1868), and

of such excellence were these articles that they have been retained, with scarcely any changes, in the second edition of this work. In his *Theology of the Old Testament* Oehler incorporated the latest results of his researches and those who have repeatedly studied his work are surprised at his erudition and the exegetical skill that he displays. To a large extent this book takes the place of a critical commentary. For several years the writer has used this work as a text-book in his class-room, and has learned to appreciate its great merits. But there are serious objections to its use as a text-book, especially on account of its fulness of treatment, as the work is better adapted for a book of reference for the scholar and pastor.

The attempt, therefore, has been made to reproduce this valuable work for use in the class-room, and for private students. It is an abridgment, and yet it is more. It aims at condensation, and yet seeks to give all that is of importance in Oehler's original work. Those who have had any experience in work of this kind know how difficult it is to condense and reproduce without omitting what is important. We would call special attention to the scripture references. The plan has been, after careful study of all the passages cited by Oehler, to select the most important, and these references are made to conform to the English Version. We have made constant use of the excellent edition published by Funk and Wagnalls, under the editorial supervision of Dr. Day of Yale Divinity

School, and take this occasion of recommending this edition which is superior to the Edinburgh edition (save in typography, the type being smaller), and in several respects even to be preferred to the original second edition of the German.

As is well-known, in such a large field of research, where the task is so great and difficult, there will be differences of opinion as to the interpretation of difficult passages. Even our most conservative theologians reach different results. And although Oehler represents the most conservative tendency of the Lutheran Theology of Germany, still there are various points on which the writer differs with him. In all such cases Oehler's views are distinctly stated, but the position of the writer is also indicated. But in almost all cases Oehler has been allowed to speak for the writer, so that what is here presented is the view that the writer himself holds of the truths as presented in the Old Testament.

R. F. W.

Ascension Day, June 3, 1886.

PREFACE TO THE SECOND EDITION.

For several years this abridged reproduction of Oehler's *Theology of the Old Testament* has been out of print, as no time could be found for a careful revision. A renewed study of the whole subject during the last few years has only deepened the conviction of the writer that no new light pertaining to the true theological meaning of the Old Testament can come from the new theories, or so called discoveries, emerging from the fertile minds of our negative Old Testament critics. On the appearance of the first edition of this work inquiries were made why more attention had not been paid to the results obtained by the literary analysis of the Old Testament. The answer then as now is simply this—these theories have not been established, they are in fact nothing but speculations. We grant that there has been a most remarkable display of minute scholarship on the part of these critics, in the discussion of words and phrases in which they have often lost themselves,—but after all, the most of it is mere fanciful conceit. A scientific presentation of their marvelously complicated theories, divergent as they are, is to most thoughtful persons, a sufficient answer, and a demonstration of their falsity. It is

positively refreshing to read some of the works of these critics and to come in contact with such positiveness of assertion and self-confidence in dissecting passages and books, the like of which has never been equalled in the whole realm of literary criticism. In nearly all cases their analysis is subjective and opinionated and rests upon certain preconceived views which have no settled and sure basis. For several years this negative school has been making rapid progress, but the tide of battle is turning in Germany, in England, and in this country. We need but refer to the labors of Zahn, Rupprecht, and the writers in the *Beweis des Glaubens*, in Germany,—to the works of Cave, Douglas, Ellicott, Girdlestone, Leathes, Sayce, and Lias, in Great Britain,—and to the writings of Green, in this country.

We, therefore, still maintain that Oehler's *Biblical Theology*, the third German edition of which appeared in 1891, has not been superseded, and that what we said concerning it in the preface to the first edition of this present work, still holds true. In this second edition we have aimed to make this abridgment still more serviceable to students by a careful revision of the whole, and by appending an analysis to each section, thus also conforming it to my *Biblical Theology of the New Testament*. In the Appendix we have aimed to give the best select literature of the subject up to date. The analytical Index has been newly prepared and much enlarged, and can be also used by students in

reviewing for examination. I am greatly indebted to the Rev. R. Morris Smith for the care with which he has read the final proof-sheets.

R. F. W.

CHICAGO LUTHERAN THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY,
Reformation Day, Oct. 31, 1896.

CONTENTS.

INTRODUCTION.

Section.	Page.
1. Summary of the Introduction.....	17
2. Definition of Old Testament Theology.....	17
3. Relation to other Old Testament Branches.....	18
4. Sources of Old Testament Theology.....	21
5. Old Testament Theology considered from a Christian Theological Standpoint.....	22
6. The Biblical Idea of Revelation.....	23
7. The Gradual Progress of Revelation.....	24
8. The Relation between the Old and New Testaments...	25
9. How the Early Church and the Middle Ages regarded the Old Testament.....	26
10. The View held in the Age of the Reformation.....	27
11. The View held by the Older Protestant Theologians...	28
12. The View held during the Eighteenth Century.....	29
13. Rise of a Biblical Theology distinct from Dogmatic....	30
14. Theological View of the Old Testament in recent Lit- erature.....	30
15. Characteristics of the Historico-Genetic Method.....	32
16. Divisions of Old Testament Theology.....	33

PART I.

MOSAISM.

SECTION I.

THE HISTORY OF REVELATION FROM THE CREATION TO THE OCCUPA- TION OF CANAAN.

17. Division of this History.....	37
-----------------------------------	----

CHAPTER I.

THE PRIMEVAL AGE.

18. The Account of the Creation.....	37
19. The Origin of Evil.....	39
20. The First Offering.....	40

CHAPTER II.

THE SECOND AGE OF THE WORLD.

21. Covenant with the World.....	43
22. The Foundation of a People of God.....	45

CHAPTER III.

THE TIME OF THE PATRIARCHS.

23. Abraham.....	47
24. Isaac and Jacob.....	50
25. The Twelve Patriarchs.....	51

CHAPTER IV.

THE TIME OF MOSES AND JOSHUA.

26. Condition of Israel in Egypt.....	53
27. The Course of Deliverance from Egypt.....	54
28. Educational Aim of the March through the Wilderness	55
29. From Egypt to Canaan.....	56
30. The Wandering in the Wilderness.....	57
31. Moses and the Book of Deuteronomy.....	58
32. Occupation of Canaan.....	60
33. The Promised Land.....	60

SECTION II.

THE DOCTRINES OF MOSAISM.

34. Survey.....	62
-----------------	----

CHAPTER V.

THE MOSAIC DOCTRINE OF GOD.

35. Survey.....	63
36. The most General Names of the Divine Being.....	63
37. El-Shaddai.....	66
38. Pronunciation and Explanation of the name Jehovah	66
39. Signification of the Name.....	67
40. Age and Origin of the Name.....	67
41. Comparison of the name Jehovah with Elohim and El	68
42. Attributes of God which are derived immediately from the Idea of Jehovah.....	69
43. The Unity of God.....	70
44. Formal Definition of God as the Holy One.....	71
45. Fuller definition of the Idea.....	73
46. Characteristics connected with the Divine Holiness: Impossibility of Picturing God, Omnipresence, Spiritu- ality.....	73

47. The Divine Righteousness, Faithfulness, and Truth....	75
48. The Jealous God.....	76

CHAPTER VI.

THE MOSAIC DOCTRINE OF THE CREATION AND PRESERVATION OF THE WORLD.

49. General Survey.....	78
50. Creation by the Word.....	78
51. The Divine Spirit in the Creation.....	79
52. On the Preservation of the World.....	80

CHAPTER VII.

THE MOSAIC DOCTRINE OF DIVINE PROVIDENCE.

53. The Design of Creation and its Realization through Providence.....	82
54. Relation of the Divine Causality to Moral and Physical Evil.....	83

CHAPTER VIII.

THE MOSAIC DOCTRINE OF REVELATION.

55. General View.....	85
56. The Revelation of the Divine Name.....	85
57. The Revelation of the Divine Countenance and the Divine Glory.....	86
58. The Divine Voice as a form of Revelation.....	87
59. The Doctrine of the Angel of the Lord exegetically stated.....	88
60. The different Interpretations.....	89
61. Other points of the Mosaic Angelology.....	91
62. The Shekhina.....	92
63. The Doctrine of Miracle.....	93
64. More exact Definition of Miracle.....	94
65. On the Spirit of God.....	94
66. The Psychical States of the Organs of Revelation.....	96

CHAPTER IX.

THE MOSAIC DOCTRINE OF THE NATURE OF MAN IN ITS MAIN UNCHANGEABLE FEATURES.

67. General View.....	98
68. The Idea of Man.....	98
69. Man in Relation to Sex and Race.....	99
70. Body, Soul, and Spirit as the Constituent Parts of Man	101
71. The Heart and its Relation to the Soul.....	102

CHAPTER X.

THE MOSAIC DOCTRINE OF MAN WITH REFERENCE TO SIN.

72.	The Primitive State of Man.....	105
73.	The Formal Principle of Sin.....	106
74.	The Material Principle of Sin.....	107
75.	Sin as an Inclination and State.....	108
76.	Degrees of Sin.....	109

CHAPTER XI.

THE MOSAIC DOCTRINE OF DEATH AND THE STATE AFTER DEATH.

77.	The Connection between Sin and Death... ..	112
78.	The Doctrine of Mosaism on the Condition after Death	113
79.	The Condition of the Soul in Sheol.....	115

SECTION III.

THE ORDINANCES OF MOSAISM.

80.	The Nature of the Covenant.....	117
-----	---------------------------------	-----

CHAPTER XII.

THE DIVINE ELECTION

81.	Israel's Election as the Free Act of God's Love.....	118
82.	Forms in which the Election of the People is expressed	118

CHAPTER XIII.

MAN'S OBLIGATION.

83.	The Servant of Jehovah.....	121
84.	The Law.....	122
85.	The Decalogue.....	123
86.	The Division of the Decalogue.....	125
87.	The Historical Origin of Circumcision.....	126
88.	Religious Import of Circumcision.....	126

CHAPTER XIV.

DIVINE RETRIBUTION.

89.	Blessing and Curse.....	128
90.	Apparent Contradiction between Divine Election and the Doctrine of Retribution.....	129

SECTION IV.

THE THEOCRACY.

91.	The Idea of the Divine Kingship.....	130
-----	--------------------------------------	-----

CHAPTER XV.

THEOCRATIC ORGANIZATION OF THE PEOPLE.

92.	The Division into Tribes.....	131
-----	-------------------------------	-----

93.	The Mode and Meaning of the Representation of Israel by the Levites.....	132
94.	Official Functions and Social Position of the Levites..	133
95.	The Priesthood.....	134
96.	The High Priest.....	136

CHAPTER XVI.

THE THEOCRATIC AUTHORITY.

97.	The Legislative Authority	139
98.	The Principle and Organization of the Administration of Justice... ..	140
99.	The Course of Justice and Punishment.....	141
100.	The Executive Power.....	142

CHAPTER XVII.

THE ORGANIZATION OF THE FAMILY.

101.	The Subdivisions of the Tribes.....	144
102.	The Law of the Marriage Contract.....	144
103.	Bars to Marriage.....	145
104.	The Dissolution of Marriage.....	146
105.	The Relation of Parents to Children.....	147
106.	The Law of Inheritance.....	148
107.	Provisions concerning the Preservation of the Family Inheritance.....	149
108.	The Avenging of Blood.....	150
109.	Bondage in the Time of the Patriarchs.....	151
110.	The Regulations concerning Hebrew Servants.....	152
111.	The Position of Servants not Israelites.....	152

SECTION V.

THE MOSAIC PUBLIC WORSHIP.

112.	The Essential Character of Public Worship.....	154
113.	The Place of the Word in Public Worship.....	155

CHAPTER XVIII.

THE PLACE OF WORSHIP.

114.	The Requisites for a Place of Worship.....	157
115.	The Arrangement of the Mosaic Sanctuary.....	158
116.	The Meaning of the Sanctuary.....	159
117.	The Sacred Vessels in the Court and in the Sanctuary	160
118.	The Ark of the Covenant, with the Kapporeth and the Tables of the Law.....	162
119.	The Cherubim.....	163

CHAPTER XIX.

THE ACTIONS OF THE MOSAIC WORSHIP.

120.	On the Idea of Offerings in General.....	165
121.	Pre-Mosaic Sacrifice and the Mosaic Covenant Sacrifice	165
122.	Bloody and Bloodless Offerings.....	167
123.	The Material of Animal Offerings.....	168
124.	The Ingredients of the Vegetable Offerings.....	168
125.	The Principle on which the Material of Offerings was fixed.....	169
126.	The Ritual of Animal Sacrifice.....	171
127.	The Use made of the Shed Blood.....	172
128.	The Burning of the Offering.....	174
129.	The Ritual of the Food-Offering.....	175
130.	Various kinds of Offerings with reference to their Purpose.....	176
131.	The Burnt-Offering.....	176
132.	The Peace-Offering.....	177
133.	The Ritual of the Peace-Offering.....	178
134.	Of Vows.....	180
135.	Nazaritism.....	181
136.	The Theocratic Taxes.....	183
137.	The Difference between the Trespass-Offering and the Sin-Offering with respect to the End in View.....	184
138.	The Ritual and Import of the Trespass-Offering.....	185
139.	The Ritual of the Sin-Offering.....	185
140.	The Ritual of the Day of Atonement.....	188
141.	Signification of the Ritual and the Antiquity of the Day of Atonement.....	191
142.	The Levitical Purifications.....	193
143.	Acts of Purification for removing the Suspicion of Guilt	194

CHAPTER XX.

THE SACRED SEASONS.

144.	Survey of the Sacred Seasons and their Designations..	196
145.	Reasons which determine the Times of the Feasts.....	197
146.	The Celebration of the Holy Days.....	197
147.	The Antiquity and Origin of the Sabbath.....	198
148.	The Idea of the Sabbath.....	199
149.	The Celebration of the Sabbath.....	200
150.	The New Moon Sabbath.....	202
151.	The Sabbatical Year and the Year of Jubilee.....	201

152.	Import and Practicability of these Institutions.....	203
153.	The Passover.....	204
154.	Significance of the Feast of the Passover.....	205
155.	The Feast of Weeks.....	207
156.	The Feast of Tabernacles.....	207

PART II.

PROPHETISM.

SECTION I.

THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE THEOCRACY FROM THE DEATH OF JOSHUA
TO THE CLOSE OF THE OLD TESTAMENT REVELATION.

CHAPTER I.

THE TIMES OF THE JUDGES

157.	Course of Events. Import of the Office of Judge.....	211
158.	Decline of the Theocratic Institutions.....	212
159.	Religious Syncretism of this Period.....	214

CHAPTER II.

FOUNDATION OF THE MONARCHY.

160.	The Philistine Oppression. Samuel.....	216
161.	Nature, Importance, and first Beginnings of the Prophetic Office.....	217
162.	The so-called Schools of the Prophets.....	219
163.	The Foundation of the Israelitish Kingdom.....	220

CHAPTER III.

PERIOD OF THE UNDIVIDED KINGDOM.

164.	Saul.....	221
165.	David.....	221
166.	The Form of Worship under David.....	223
167.	Solomon. The Building of the Temple.....	225
168.	Significance and Dedication of the Temple.....	226
169.	Hebrew Proverbial Poetry.....	227
170.	Solomon's External Organizations.....	228

CHAPTER IV.

THE KINGDOM OF THE TEN TRIBES.

171.	Preliminary Remarks.....	230
172.	Jeroboam I. to Omri.....	230
173.	The Dynasty of Omri.....	232

174.	The Prophetism of the Period. The Rechabites.....	233
175.	The Dynasty of Jehu.....	234
176.	From Zachariah to the Captivity of the Ten Tribes.....	235
177.	Origin of the Samaritans.....	237

CHAPTER V.

THE KINGDOM OF JUDAH.

178.	Preliminary Remarks and Survey.....	239
179.	Rehoboam to Jehosaphat.....	240
180.	Jehoram to Jotham.....	240
181.	Ahaz and Hezekiah.....	241
182.	Manasseh and Amon.....	243
183.	Josiah.....	243
184.	Profane History of this Period.....	244
185.	Jehoiakim and Jehoiachin.....	244
186.	Zedekiah. Fall of Jerusalem.....	246
187.	Gedaliah and the Remnant of the People.....	247

CHAPTER VI.

THE EXILIC AND POST-EXILIC HISTORY OF THE JEWS.

188.	Condition of the People during the Captivity.....	248
189.	Return of the Jews from Babylon.....	249
190.	The Period from Cyrus to Darius Hystaspes.....	250
191.	The Jews under Xerxes.....	251
192.	Ezra and Nehemiah. The Close of Prophecy.....	251
193.	The Scribes. Public Worship.....	252

SECTION II.

THE THEOLOGY OF PROPHETISM.

194.	Summary.....	254
------	--------------	-----

CHAPTER VII.

THE DOCTRINE OF THE LORD OF HOSTS AND OF ANGELS.

195.	The Meaning of Jehovah Sabaoth..	254
196.	The Host of Heaven.....	256
197.	The Host of the Heavenly Spirits.....	256
198.	The Significance of the Doctrine of Jehovah Sabaoth..	258
199.	Angels of Higher Order and their Special Calling.....	258
200.	The Doctrine of Satan.....	260

CHAPTER VIII.

MAN'S RELIGIOUS AND MORAL RELATION TO GOD.

201.	Distinction between the Ceremonial and the Moral Law	264
202.	The Ruinous Nature of Sin.....	265

203.	The Old Testament Form of Faith.....	267
204.	The Old Testament Experience of Salvation.....	268

SECTION III.

OF PROPHECY.

CHAPTER IX.

THE PROPHETIC CONSCIOUSNESS.

205.	Negative Propositions.....	270
206.	Positive Propositions.....	270
207.	Psychological Definition of the Prophetic State in Ancient Times.....	272
208.	View of this Subject in the Older Protestant Theology	273
209.	Continuity and Elevation of the Individual Life in the Prophetic State.....	275
210.	Prophecy an Inward Intuition.....	276
211.	The Prophetic State illustrated by Analogies.....	278
212.	The Conceptions of Genius and the Natural Powers of Divination.....	279

CHAPTER X

OF PROPHECY.

213.	Its Office in General.....	281
214.	The Prediction of Particular Events an Essential Element of Prophecy.....	281
215.	The Peculiarities of Old Testament Prophecy.....	282
216.	Prophecy and Fulfilment.....	284

SECTION IV.

OF THE KINGDOM OF GOD.

217.	Survey.....	288
------	-------------	-----

CHAPTER XI.

THE PURPOSE OF THE KINGDOM OF GOD

218.	The Design of God's Kingdom.....	288
219.	The Relation of the Present to God's Purpose.....	290
220.	The Judgment upon the Covenant People.....	290
221.	The Judgment upon the Heathen Nations.....	292

CHAPTER XII.

THE DELIVERANCE AND RESTORATION OF THE COVENANT PEOPLE.

222.	The Restoration of Israel a Necessary Event	295
223.	The New Covenant an Everlasting One.....	296

224.	Other Features of the Times of Redemption.....	298
225.	Death destroyed.....	299
226.	The Resurrection.....	300

CHAPTER XIII.

THE ADMISSION OF THE HEATHEN INTO THE KINGDOM OF GOD.

227.	The Extension of the Kingdom of God in the Times of Redemption.....	302
228.	The Conditions under which the Heathen are admitted into the Kingdom of God.....	303

CHAPTER XIV.

THE MESSIAH.

229.	The Messianic Hope.....	305
230.	The Messianic Psalms.....	306
231.	The Development of the Idea of the Messiah in the Prophets.....	307
232.	The Office and Work of the Messiah.....	309
233.	The Servant of Jehovah.....	310
234.	The Messiah is the Atoning High Priest.....	312

PART III.

OLD TESTAMENT WISDOM.

235.	The Nature of Old Testament Wisdom.....	315
236.	The Contents of Old Testament Wisdom.....	316

CHAPTER I.

OBJECTIVE DIVINE WISDOM.

237.	The Personification of Wisdom.....	318
238.	The Old Testament View of Nature.....	319
239.	The Control of Wisdom in Human Affairs.....	319

CHAPTER II.

SUBJECTIVE HUMAN WISDOM.

240.	The Fear of the Lord the Subjective Principle of Wisdom.....	321
241.	Practical Wisdom.....	322
242.	The Ethics of the Proverbs.....	322

CHAPTER III.

MORAL GOOD.

243.	Its Realization in the Individual Life.....	324
244.	Realization of Moral Good in the various Social Spheres	325

CHAPTER IV.

THE ENIGMAS OF HUMAN LIFE.

245.	The Enigmas themselves	327
246.	The Struggle to solve the Enigmas relating to this Subject in the Psalms.....	327
247.	Solution of the Enigmas in the Book of Job.....	329
248.	The Doctrine of Immortality in the Book of Job.....	331

CHAPTER V.

THE SOLUTION ATTEMPTED IN THE BOOK OF ECCLESIASTES.

249.	Standpoint of the Book of Ecclesiastes.....	333
250.	Moral Teaching of the Book.....	334
	Select Literature.....	336
	Index	345

BIBLICAL THEOLOGY OF THE OLD TESTAMENT.

INTRODUCTION.

§ 1. Summary of the Introduction.

The Introduction has for its aim

1) To define the Theology of the Old Testament, and its relation to the cognate branches of Biblical Science;

2) To present the conception of the Old Testament religion presupposed in our exhibition of the subject, together with the scientific standpoint of Old Testament Theology thereby given;

3) To present a brief history of this branch of theology;

4) To discuss the method of Old Testament Theology, and present its divisions.

§ 2. Definition of Old Testament Theology.

Biblical Theology¹ of the Old Testament has for its task the historical exhibition of the religion contained

¹ "To the term 'Biblical Theology' we do not attach any special importance. It has become current through the works of Gabler, Schmid, and Oehler, and it seems to us decidedly preferable to the other term, 'Biblical Dogmatics', which De Wette and Hagenbach defend." (Schultz, p. 3.)

in the canonical books of the Old Testament, according to its progressive development and the variety of the forms in which it appears. It cannot, therefore, limit itself to the directly didactic matter in the Old Testament, but must also embrace the chief features of the history of the divine kingdom in the Old Testament. It has to handle as such *what is only in germ*, and to show how the Old Testament, in the narrowness and unfinished state which characterizes in many parts its doctrinal contents, points from itself to something higher.

Schultz defines Biblical theology as "that branch of theological science which gives a historical presentation of revealed religion during the period of its growth."

[Analysis: 1) Aim of the science; 2) definition of Schultz; 3) is a historical science; 4) revelation is progressive.]

§ 3. Relation to other Old Testament Branches.

1) The study of what is called *Introduction to the Old Testament* precedes the study of Old Testament Theology, but the two stand to each other in a relation of mutual dependence. To the former science we leave all critical investigations as to the authenticity, authorship, and integrity, of the Old Testament writings.¹

¹ Oehler: "If a critic takes a view of revelation which is far from harmonious with the biblical one, and devises a scheme of sacred history which the history itself does not acknowledge, he will from these presuppositions judge of the time when these books originated, and of other things quite differently from what they themselves testify. . . . If the Bible is the record of Revelation, and if it is only through the Bible that the theologian receives the impression of the majesty of revelation as a mighty historical fact we should expect of him that, before he criticises the Bible, he should first surrender himself to its contents without preconceived opinions—should let the revelation in its majesty work directly upon him, in order, as Rothe (*Zur Dogmatik*, p. 329) strikingly expresses it, 'to make it a constant factor in the experience of his personal life.' He who has won in this way the conviction

2) Old Testament Theology has a part of its contents in common with *Biblical Archæology*, which latter treats of the whole natural and social condition of the people of Israel. The discussion of all purely technical questions, however, must be left to Archæology, and even in those topics which are common—the field of morals and of public worship,—there must be a treatment differing not merely in fulness, but in some measure also in form. On all such matters Biblical Theology has simply to take from Archæology its results as accepted facts.

3) There is a close relation between *Old Testament Theology* and *Israelitish History*, and yet the two branches are entirely distinct. *Old Testament Theology* is bound to reproduce faithfully, and without admixture of modern ways of looking at history, the view which the holy Scriptures themselves give of the purpose of salvation which is carried out in Israel.¹ The *History*

that Holy Scripture is the truly witnessing record of the divine purpose of salvation, and of the historical facts which serve to its realization,—in the joyful consciousness of his faith in revelation, will certainly refuse to be bound by human traditions concerning Holy Scripture, whether these originated with the Jewish Scribes, or with the ancient church, or with our older Protestant theology, whatever be the respect which he may feel due to them; but neither will he surrender himself to a criticism in which he can everywhere see that it does not rest upon the consciousness of faith which Rothe commends."

¹ Oehler: "The history of Israel contains a series of facts which form the basis of the Old Testament religion. If we deny the Exodus of Israel from Egypt, and the giving of the law from Sinai, the Old Testament religion floats in the air. Such facts can no more be separated from the religion of the Old Testament than the historical facts of Christ's person from Christianity. . . . Here there must be strife between those who acknowledge as facts what the Old Testament lays down as such, and are consequently convinced that the **thing believed** was also a thing which **took place**, and between those who see in the Old Testament faith mainly a product of religious **ideas**, the historical basis of which can be ascertained only by a critical process resting on rationalistic presuppositions. . . . Whoever occupies the historico-critical standpoint on this subject should endeavor to get at the point of view

of Israel, on the other hand, has not only to present all sides of the historical development of the people of Israel, but to sift and vindicate, by historico-critical research, the real historical facts which the Theology of the Old Testament reproduces as the contents of faith.

4) Biblical Theology has of necessity a close connection with the *Exegesis* of Scripture. As a necessary preliminary to our science, one must study the expository works which deal with the doctrinal ideas of specially important single books or groups of books. Taken along with the works which trace single doctrines through all the different Biblical books, such writings would, if complete, provide us with almost all the material we require. We should then have the warp and the woof, out of which we could without much trouble weave the web of Biblical Theology.¹

5) This science has also a close connection with *Systematic Theology* (which includes the three sciences of Apologetics, Dogmatics, and Ethics), for it provides a form of Scripture proof on a larger scale than can be got from single texts. But Biblical Theology is distinct in form and contents from Systematic Theology.² It is the historical counterpart of Dogmatics

of the Bible itself in its purity, without admixture of modern views. . . . No criticism has as yet robbed of its force the judgment of Herder respecting the history of the Old Testament: 'A thing of that kind cannot be invented; such history, with all that depends on it, and all that is connected with it—in short, such a people cannot be a fiction. Its yet uncompleted providential guidance is the greatest poem of the ages, and advances probably (we say **certainly**, on the ground of Rom. 11: 25, 26) to the solution of the mysterious riddle of the world's history.'

¹ See **Schultz**; p. 4.

² **Schultz**: "No result of O. T. Theology can become a constituent part of Systematic Theology till its further development in Christianity has been recognized, in other words, except through the medium of N. T. Theology,—for there is not a single Christian

and Ethics, not their substitute, and precedes the study of Dogmatics. We may also add that Dogmatic Theology should balance and correct Biblical Theology, first, because the latter, as a rule, is based only upon certain parts of Scripture, and its method is fractional, and secondly, because it is more easy to introduce subjective individual opinions into a part of the Bible, than into the whole of it.¹

6) Biblical Theology, therefore, lies wholly within the circle of historical theology and has a well-defined province of its own, and is one of the most indispensable branches of theological science.

7) As Old Testament Theology must report what men in the Old Testament believed, in what faith they lived and died, as it has to exhibit the history of revelation and to reproduce the view which Holy Scripture itself has, we have nothing to do with ethnological and geographical research, and with attempts of harmonizing the Old Testament history of creation and other things of this kind with the propositions of the newer physical sciences.

[Analysis: 1) Its relation to Biblical Introduction; 2) the true Biblical critic; 3) its relation to Biblical Archaeology; 4) to Sacred History; 5) Negative Higher Criticism; 6) Biblical Theology closely related to Exegesis; 7) to Systematic Theology; 8) is a historical science; 9) does not aim to reconcile science and theology.]

§ 4. Sources of Old Testament Theology.

These sources must be limited to the books of the *Old Testament Canon* as received by the Scribes in Palestine, acknowledged by the Protestant Church, thus excluding the Old Testament *Apocrypha*. That the Canon of the Protestant Church is that of the conception but has its roots in the O. T., and which Christianity does not set in a new light,—and not till then is it rendered perfect (p. 6).

¹ See Weidner, *Introduction to Dogmatic Theology*. 2nd ed., p. 37.

Judaism of Palestine, as established in the last century before Christ, and then re-sanctioned after temporary hesitation at the Sanhedrim in Jamnia about A. D. 90, is not disputed. According to the declarations of Christ in Luke 24: 44; Matt. 11: 13, 14, and the whole Apostolic doctrine, there can remain no doubt as to where the Old and New Testaments are connected, since even the beginning of the New Testament history of revelation attaches itself directly to the close of Old Testament prophecy in Malachi (Matt. 11: 13; 14).

[Analysis: 1) The Old Testament the only source; 2) the Protestant Church accepts the Canon of the Jews.]

§ 5. Old Testament Theology considered from a Christian theological standpoint.

The view we have of the Theology of the Old Testament is already expressed in the name we give to this branch of theology, for we will not treat simply of the Jewish religion, but of the divine revelation of the Old Testament, which on the one hand is fundamentally different from all heathen religions, and on the other forms the preliminary stage to the revelation of the New Testament, which is with it comprehended in one divine economy of salvation.¹ The entire Old Testament remains a sealed book, if we fail to see that the subduing of the natural character of the people is the whole aim of the divine tuition.

¹ Oehler: "The view of the Old Testament which is now prominent and which claims that it seeks to understand the Old Testament historically, is, that Israel by virtue of a certain genius for religion was more successful in the search of true religion than the other nations of antiquity, and soared higher than the rest toward the purest divine thoughts and endeavors. . . . Yet, although individual contributions made to the matter of O. T. theology from this standpoint have great value, the O. T. can never be historically understood in this way. Does even a single page of the O. T. agree with this view, by which Israel is represented as a people of such genius in the production of religious thought, and the O. T. religion as a natural product of the Israelitish spirit?"

[Analysis: 1) The revelation of the O. T. differs from heathen religions; 2) is closely related to the N. T.; 3) the modern critical view of the O. T.; 4) but the O. T. religion is not a natural product of Israel.]

§ 6. The Biblical Idea of Revelation. General and Special Revelation.

The Biblical idea of Revelation has its root in the idea of Creation. The production of different classes of beings advances teleologically, and reaches its goal only when God has created man in his own image. In this progression the foundation of revelation is laid. For revelation is, in general, God's witness and communication of Himself to the world for the realization of the end of Creation and the re-establishing of the full communion of man with God.¹ God testifies, partly in nature and the historical guidance of mankind, and partly in each one's conscience, of His power, goodness, and justice, and thus draws man to seek God (Isa. 40: 21-26; Jer. 10: 1-25; Ps. 19: 1-6; 94: 8-10).

The original communion of man with God destroyed by sin, is not recovered by means of this *general revelation*. The living God remains to the natural man, in all his searchings, a hidden God (Isa. 45: 15; Jer. 23: 18; John 1: 18). It is only by God's stooping to man in personal testimony of Himself, and by the objective presentation of Himself, that a vital communion is actually established between God and man. This is the *special revelation* which first appears in the form of a covenant between God and a chosen race, and the founding of a Kingdom of God among

¹ Philippi: "God can only place Himself in fellowship with man through revelation. . . In our Christian consciousness we know only of two central and fundamental acts of Revelation on the part of God, the act of Creation and the act of Redemption." (Glaubenslehre I. 12, 13).

the latter culminates in the manifestation of God in the flesh, advances from this point to the gathering of a people of God in all nations, and is completed in the making of a new heaven and a new earth (Isa. 65: 17; 66: 22; Rev. 21: 1, 2), where God shall be all in all (1 Cor. 15: 28). The relation between *general* and *special revelation* is such, that the former is the continual basis of the latter, the latter the aim and completion of the former.

[Analysis: 1) Revelation has its root in Creation; 2) there are only two fundamental acts of revelation; 3) general revelation; 4) special revelation; 5) the relation between the two.]

§ 7. Historical Character and gradual progress of Revelation. Its supernatural character.

The special revelation of God does not at a bound enter the world all finished and complete, but as it enters the sphere of human life, it observes the laws of historical development which are grounded in the general divine system of the world. And because revelation aims at the restoration of full communion between God and man, it is directed to the whole of man's life, and not exclusively or mainly to man's faculty of knowledge. Biblical revelation, as here defined, is distinguished from the view of the older Protestant Theology in two respects: 1) in the older Protestant Theology revelation was essentially, and almost exclusively, regarded as *doctrine*. But Revelation cannot possibly confine itself to the cognitive side of man. Biblical Theology must be a theology of divine *facts*. 2) The Older Theology failed to recognize the *general development* which revelation passes through in Scripture itself. The Bible was supposed to attest equally, in the Old and New Testaments, the truths which the Church has accepted as doctrines.

Revelation makes itself known as differing from the natural revelations of the human mind, not only by the continuity and the organic connection of the facts which constitute the history of salvation, but also in its special character (*miracle*), which points distinctly to a divine causality. A miracle is revelation in the form of a divine act, prophecy is revelation in the form of a divine word.

The living *experience of salvation* is first found complete on the basis of the New Testament revelation.

[**Analysis:** 1) Revelation is progressive; 2) its aim; 3) this presentation differs in two respects from the view of the older Protestant theology; 4) its difference from natural revelation.]

§ 8. The Old and New Testaments in their relation to each other.

Revelation falls into two principal divisions, the *Old* and the *New Testament*, which stand to each other in the relation of preparation and fulfilment, and are thus, as a connected dispensation of salvation, distinguished from all other religions (Eph. 2: 12). But the *unity* of the Old and New Testament must not be understood as *identity*. The *Old Testament itself* acknowledges that the manifestation of God's Kingdom at that time was imperfect and temporary, and, indeed, at the very time in which the old form of the theocracy was overthrown, it predicted the new eternal covenant which God would make with his people (Jer. 31: 31–34). Still more distinctly does the *New Testament* emphasize the difference from the Old which subsists within the unity of the two Testaments. The eternal counsel of salvation, although announced by the prophets, is nevertheless not completely revealed till after its actual realization (Rom. 16: 25, 26; 1 Pet. 1: 10–12; Eph. 1: 9, 10; 3: 5). The tuition of the law reached its goal in the grace and truth of Christ

(John 1: 17; Rom. 10: 4; Gal. 3: 24, 25). In the saving benefits of the new covenant, the shadow of the old dispensation passes into reality (Col. 2: 17; Heb. 10: 1-4); therefore the greatest man in the old covenant is less than the least in the kingdom of Christ (Matt. 11: 11).

[**Analysis:** 1) Relation between the Old and New T.; 2) their unity; 3) their difference; 4) aim of the O. T.]

§ 9. Theological View of the Old Testament in the Early Church and Middle Ages.

Old Testament Theology, as an independent branch of study, is, like Biblical Theology in general, a modern science. During the whole development of Church doctrine down to the middle of the present century, no distinct line was drawn between the essential contents of revelation as they are laid down in the Scriptures and the doctrinal formulas elaborated from them; and still less were the successive stages of revelation and types of doctrine which are presented in Scripture recognized. The proposition, "the New Testament lies hidden in the Old, the Old Testament lies open in the New,"¹ which is in itself correct, was so perverted as to be made to mean that the whole of Christian theology, veiled indeed, but already fully formed, could be shown to exist in the Old Testament.

The New Testament references to the Old Testament are limited by the occasions afforded in the Gospel history and the apostolic trains of thought, but especially valuable for this purpose are the Epistle to the Hebrews and the Gospel of Matthew. A more systematic discussion of the representations concerning Christ in the Old Testament begins with the Epistle of Bar-

· 1 *Novum Testamentum in Vetere latet, Vetus Testamentum in Novo patet.*

nabas (71–120 A. D.), and in Justin's Dialogue with Trypho (died about 163 A. D.). We may regard the three books (Lib. xv–xvii) in Augustine's great work *De Civitate Dei*, as in a certain sense the first treatment of the Theology of the Old Testament. The study of the Old Testament in the Ancient Church reaches its close with Gregory the Great. The cultivation of Biblical Theology as a historical science was not possible under the influence of the theology of the Middle Ages. True, much detached matter valuable for the Old Testament was brought to light in the Middle Ages, and especially on the Song of Solomon, in which the Mysticism of the Middle Ages lives and moves, as Bernard of Clairvaux's lectures on Canticles show,—but this belongs not to Biblical Theology.

[Analysis: 1) O. T. Theology a modern science; 2) formerly no stages of revelation recognized; 3) Augustine; 4) the Middle Ages.]

§ 10. Theological View of the Old Testament in the Age of the Reformation.

The Reformation principle of the supreme authority of Scripture drew the attention of theologians to the Old Testament as well as the New. To Johann Reuchlin (*d.* 1522), the uncle of Melancthon, must be given the credit not simply of opening a path for the study of Hebrew in Germany, but also for so firmly maintaining that it is the duty of the expositor of Scripture to go back to the original text expounded according to its literal sense, and to refuse to be dependent on the Vulgate and the traditional expositions of the Church which are connected with it.

The recognition of the *difference between the Law and the Gospel* derived from Paul's Epistles was the first thing that gave the *Reformers* a key to the theological

meaning of the Old Testament. They also correctly recognized, that even in the Old Testament a revelation of God's *gracious will* in the promise of salvation goes side by side with the revelation of the *demands* of the divine will in the law. Of all that is connected with this practical sphere in the Old Testament, Luther especially shows a profound understanding, springing from a lively personal experience. In the view which the Reformers (and especially Melancthon) were fond of developing, that the Church began in Paradise and continues throughout all time, the whole emphasis is laid on the *doctrinal* unity of revelation, existing under all change of outward forms. The theological principle of exposition by the *analogy of faith*, that Scripture should be explained by Scripture, is a principle in itself perfectly correct, and to have stated it, is one of the greatest merits of Protestant theology, but the Reformers did not properly apply it; the unity of the Old and New Testaments was conceived of, not as produced by a gradually advancing process of development, but as a harmony of doctrine. .

[Analysis: 1) Reuchlin; 2) Luther; 3) Melancthon; 4) the analogy of faith; 5) the practical-theological exposition of the Reformers does not do full justice to the historical meaning of the Old Testament.]

§ 11. Theological Conception of the Old Testament in the Older Protestant Theology.

The treatment of the Old Testament in the *older Protestant Theology* was determined by the principles just stated. The contents of the Scriptures were set forth with strict regard to the systematic doctrines of the Church, and without respect to the historical manifoldness of the Scriptures themselves. The Old Testament was used in all its parts, just like the New

Testament, for proofs of doctrine. In opposition to the Romish theologians, especially Bellarmine, it was taught on the side of Protestants, that in respect to the fundamental doctrines, the Old Testament was in no way incomplete; and that these were only repeated more distinctly in the New Testament.

[Analysis: 1) Seventeenth century theologians governed by same principles; 2) in fundamental doctrines the O. T. was in no way incomplete.]

§ 12. Theological Treatment of the Old Testament from 1700 to 1800.

In the Lutheran Church, *Collegia Biblica*, or topical lectures became common from the end of the seventeenth century onward. These lectures, which contained exegetico-dogmatical discussions of the most important proof-texts of the doctrines of the Church, gave some impulse to the study of Biblical as distinguished from Doctrinal Theology, but cannot be regarded as of much consequence. In this connection must be mentioned the influence of Spener (1635—1705) and of Bengel (1687—1751). The latter insisted on an organic and historical conception of biblical revelation with strict regard to the difference of its stages. In this connection we may also mention the names of Roos, Burk, Hiller, Oetinger, and Crusius, who all have written profoundly on this subject, though in a plain and simple form.

The writings of the apologists Lardner, Warburton, and others, directed against English Deism, contributed also much important matter to the biblical branches of theology, but made little headway against their opponents, because they agreed with them in placing the O. T. institutions on the ground of bare utility.

[Analysis: 1) Topical lectures; 2) influence of Spener; 3) of Bengel; 4) the school of Bengel; 5) the English Apologists.]

§ 13. Rise of a Biblical Theology distinct from Dogmatic. Treatment of the Old Testament by Rationalism.

John Philip Gabler¹ is regarded as the first who distinctly spoke of Biblical Theology as an historical science. George Lorenz Bauer (1755–1806) may be viewed as a leading representative of the rationalistic treatment of the Old Testament at this period.² The hints respecting a treatment of the Old Testament as an organic history, which had been offered by Herder (1744–1803),³ were taken up by De Wette (1780–1849) with discriminating appreciation. Ewald (1803–75) in his various works⁴ has interwoven with his narrative a full account of the growth of the Old Testament religion, but his vague notion of revelation does not raise him essentially above the rationalistic method which he despises. Various attempts have also been made to throw light on the narrative of Genesis and the institutions of Moses from the comparative history of religion.

[Analysis: 1) Gabler; 2) Bauer; 3) Ewald.]

§ 14. Theological View of the Old Testament in the most Recent Literature.

The first to exert a decisive influence on the theological treatment of the Old Testament was Hengstenberg (*d.* 1869).⁵ The position which Hengstenberg first took in treating the Old Testament, and which

¹ In his academic oration, *De justo discrimine theologiæ biblicæ et dogmaticæ*, 1787.

² He wrote on nearly all the departments of Old Testament study.

³ See his *Letters on the Study of Theology*.

⁴ *History of the People of Israel* (8 volumes); *Antiquities of Israel* (1 vol.); *Commentaries on the Prophets* (5 vols.); *Revelation* (1 vol.); *Old and New Testament Theology* (1 vol.).

⁵ Mainly by his *Christology of the Old Testament*, 2nd ed., 1854–57. (English trans. in 4 vols. Edinburgh, 1854–58.)

he never except partially relinquished, is essentially that of the old Protestant theology; for while not accepting all the tenets of the latter, he yet very distinctly aimed at finding all the fundamental New Testament doctrines in the Old Testament, not in a process of growth, but ready made. The work of Hævernick¹ contains much that is good. Valuable contributions to the theology of the Old Testament are found in the works of Hofmann,² Auberlen,³ Beck,⁴ Delitzsch,⁵ and F.W.Schultz.⁶ The works of Herman Schultz,⁷ Riehm,⁸ and Piepenbring⁹ contain a valuable collection of material on almost every topic connected with the Old Testament, but are written from the standpoint of the modern critical and analytical view of the Old Testament, according to which the priestly legislation of the middle books of the Pentateuch is a post-exilic production.¹⁰ As suggestive compends we would rec-

¹ *Vorlesungen ueber die Theologie des A. T.* Second ed., with additions by Herman Schultz, 1863.

² *Weissagung etc.*, 1841—44; *Schriftbeweis*, second ed., 3 vols., 1857—60.

³ In his *Divine Revelation*. Edinburgh, 1867.

⁴ *Christliche Lehrwissenschaft*. 1841.

⁵ *Biblical Psychology*. Edinburgh, 1869; *Old Test. Hist. of Redemption*. Edinburgh, 1881; *Messianic Prophecies*. Edinburgh, 1891.

⁶ In Zöckler's *Handbuch der theol. Wissenschaften*.

⁷ *Alttestamentliche Theologie*. 4th ed., completely revised, 1889. English transl. in 2 vols. Edinburgh, 1892.

⁸ *Alttestamentliche Theologie*. Halle 1889. Compare also his *Einleitung in das A. T.* 2 vols. 1889, 1890.

⁹ *Theology of the Old Testament*. Transl. from the French. New York, 1893.

¹⁰ The position of Herman Schultz can be inferred from the following quotation: "Genesis is the book of sacred legend, with a mythical introduction. The first three chapters of it, in particular, present us with the revelation-myths of the most important kind, and the following eight with mythical elements that have been recast more in the form of legend. From Abraham to Moses we have national legend pure and simple, mixed with a variety of mythical elements which have become almost unrecognizable.

commend the work of Schlottmann,¹ and the small work on this subject which has appeared in the *Theologische Repetitorien*.² But the most important work on this subject that has as yet appeared is the famous work of *Gustav Fredrich Oehler*,³ and it is a question whether it ever will be superseded.

[Analysis: 1) The position of Hengstenberg; 2) Hoffman; 3) Delitzsch; 4) Herman Schultz; 5) Schlottmann; 6) Oehler.]

§ 15. Characteristics of the Historico-Genetic Method.

As a historical science, Biblical Theology rests on the results of *grammatico-historical exegesis*, the business of which is to reproduce the contents of the Biblical books according to the rules of language, with due regard to the historical circumstances under which the books originated, and the individual relations of sacred writers. Biblical Theology, however, must view the Old Testament in the light of the completed revelation of God in Christ for which it formed the preparation,—must show how God's saving purpose, fulfilled in Christ, moved through the preliminary stages of this history of revelation. Theological exegesis, in the right sense of the word, is not affected by the fact that Stier and other writers have brought theological interpretation into bad repute, by their habit of finding a second, third, and fourth subor-

From Moses to David we have history still mixed with a great deal of the legendary, and even partly with mythical elements that are no longer distinguishable. From David onwards we have history, with no more legendary elements in it than are everywhere present in history as written by the ancients" (page 31).

¹ Kompendium der bibl. Theologie des A. und N. T. Leipsic, 1889; 2nd ed., 1894.

² Published by Schultze's Verlag, Berlin. 1890.

³ The first German edition appeared in 1873-4; the first English edition in 1874-5, the second German edition in 1882; Revised English edition by Day, 1883; the first edition of my abridgement in 1886; and the third German edition in 1891.

dinate and secondary sense in the Old Testament besides the historico-grammatical sense.

[Analysis: 1) Biblical Theology rests on grammatico-historical exegesis; 2) the N. T. is the true interpreter of the O. T.; 3) Scripture has not a multiple sense.]

§ 16. Divisions of Old Testament Theology.

The proper divisions are given by the following considerations: The basis of the Old Testament religion is the *Covenant* with the chosen people, into which God entered for the accomplishment of his saving purpose. This covenant, for which the way is prepared in the first two ages of the world, is carried out in two stages: 1) The patriarchal covenant of promise; and 2) The Mosaic covenant of the law, on the basis of which the theocracy is founded. This whole sphere may be summed up in the name *Mosaism*.¹

The second part of Old Testament Theology, which we will briefly call *Prophetism*, deals with those elements in the history of the people of Israel from their entrance into the Promised Land which are important for the development of God's Kingdom, considering these as they appear in the light of prophecy, and also discusses the theology of prophecy itself.

The third division embraces Old Testament *Wisdom*,

¹ It is not the aim of a work on Biblical Theology to answer the objections raised by the analytical school of Wellhausen, Driver, and others. These critics may distribute the Pentateuch and Joshua among as many different authors as they please, and rearrange the whole Old Testament Canon to suit their own views, still this does not prove their assertions, and a mere presentation of their marvelously complicated theory of the origin of the Old Testament, to most persons is a sufficient answer, and a demonstration of its falsity. Though there has been a remarkable display of minute scholarship on the part of these critics, and their positiveness and self-confidence in dissecting passages and books has never been equalled in the whole realm of theological scholarship,—most of it is pure speculation and mere fanciful conceit. We write this deliberately with a full acquaintance of all the latest phases of this controversy.

which equally with prophecy has its root in the law, but develops itself independently of prophecy.

The division of the Old Testament Canon into *Law, Prophets, and Hagiographa*, though not entirely agreeing with this division, points at least toward it.

[Analysis: 1) Mosaism; 2) Prophetism; 3) Old Testament Wisdom; 4) the modern analytical view does not affect this method of presentation.]

PART I.



MOSAISM.

PART I.

MOSAISM.

SECTION I.

**THE HISTORY OF REVELATION FROM THE CREATION TO
THE OCCUPATION OF CANAAN.**

§ 17. Division of this History.

The Pentateuch plainly distinguishes four periods in the history of revelation :

1) The Primeval Age, with ten patriarchs, closing with the deluge.

2) The second age of the world, beginning with the world-covenant in Noah's time, also with ten generations.

3) The time of the three great patriarchs, beginning with the covenant of promise made with Abraham, and ending with the sojourn of the chosen people in Egypt.

4) The time of Moses and Joshua, including the giving of the covenant of the law, and the establishment of the theocracy, with its regulations.

CHAPTER I.

THE PRIMEVAL AGE.

§ 18. The Account of the Creation.

The Old Testament begins with the account of the Creation of the world, which is the result of the Word and the Spirit of God. We have here, on the thresh-

old of the revelation of God to man, an account of creation free from mythological additions, and the Bible narrative, by its simplicity, its chaste, positive historical character, is in sharp contrast with the fanciful, allegorical, intricate cosmogonies of all heathen religions.¹

Since God by His *Word* calls all things into being, He is placed above the beginning of all time as the eternal and absolutely independent One; since He animates the universe by His *Spirit*, all dualistic separation of God and the world is excluded.²

The production of beings advances continually toward higher organisms, and we cannot fail to observe a parallel between the first three and the last three days' work. Still the divine creative power is not satisfied till it reaches its ultimate end in the creation of *man*.³

The paragraph Gen. 2: 4-25 is by no means a second record of creation, but shows, in supplementing the first chapter, that the earth was prepared for

¹ A comparison of the early history of the Bible with the cuneiform inscriptions is extremely interesting, both on account of their remarkable resemblance and their characteristic difference. See Sayce: *Fresh Light from the Ancient Monuments*; Walsh: *Echoes of Bible History*. 1891.

² Cuvier: "A sublimer passage than this from the first word to the last never can or will come from a human pen, 'In the beginning God created the heaven and the earth.'"

Murphy in his *Commentary on Genesis*: "This simple sentence denies atheism; for it assumes the being of God. It denies polytheism, and, among its various forms, the doctrines of two eternal principles the one good and the other evil,—for it confesses the one eternal Creator. It denies materialism, for it asserts the creation of matter. It denies pantheism, for it assumes the existence of God before all things, and apart from them. It denies fatalism, for it involves the freedom of the Eternal Being."

Delitzsch: The creation which is here intended is the first beginning, which was not preceded by any other, hence the creation of the universe, which also embraces the heaven of heavens. (*O. T. Hist. of Redemption*, p. 13).

³ For further study see Guyot: *Creation, or the Biblical Cosmogony in the Light of Modern Science*. 1884.

a habitation for man—a sphere for his activity, and a place for the revelation of God to man.¹

[Analysis: 1) Biblical account of creation differs from heathen cosmogonies; 2) testimony of Cuvier; 3) deductions of Murphy; 4) a progress in creation; 5) not two records of creation; 6) difference between the two accounts.]

§ 19. The Origin of Evil.

The world as a divine creation is good (Gen. 1: 31); every development of life in it is a divine blessing (Gen. 1: 22, 28); there is no room here for a principle which, in its original nature, is wicked and inimical to God. Man is called to be a free being; therefore a command is given to him for self-decision (Gen. 2: 16), in order that he may pass from the condition of innocence to that of *free obedience*. Man falls under the temptation addressed to him from without.² Through sin the bond of child-like communion with God is broken; and now man is in a sense independent like God (Gen. 3: 22); but fear resting in the feeling of guilt, dominates from this time forward his position toward God (Gen. 3: 8–10). The life in Paradise with its peace is forfeited, and man sinks henceforth under the service of perishable things and of death (Gen. 3: 17–24). Nevertheless conscience, which testifies of guilt, shows also man's capability of being redeemed; and side by side with the curse a divine word points forward to a victorious end of the conflict (Gen. 3: 15). The seed of the serpent, which by cunning overcame the woman, shall be vanquished

¹ **Delitzsch**: The difference between the two accounts is, that Gen. 1: 1–2: 3 relates the origin of the human race, and Gen. 2: 4–25 that of the first man and of the first human pair; in the former man appears as the object and end of the line of creation, in the latter as the centre of the circle of creation. (*Genesis*).

² Some maintain that the fall of the spirit-world took place before the beginning of the six days' creation, placing it between verses 1 and 2, of the first chapter of Genesis, and such a view cannot be confuted, nor, on the other hand, can it be proved.

in open combat by the seed of the woman. Oehler maintains, however, that the older theology erred when it sought to find here (in Gen. 3: 15) the Messiah, the great destroyer of the serpent, *directly* promised, although he is willing to grant that it did not err in the general conception of the thought in the passage.¹

[Analysis: 1) The origin of evil is not in man; 2) the time of the fall of Satan; 3) the effect of sin; 4) man's capability of being redeemed; 5) Delitzsch lays stress on four points; 6) Oehler's explanation of Gen. 3. 15; 7) the exposition of Delitzsch.]

§ 20. The First Offering. Cainites and Sethites. Tradition of the Flood.

The *first offering* (Gen. 4) is not to be regarded as a proper sin-offering, but rather an offering of *supplication* as well as of *gratitude*, or, in a wider sense of the word we may designate it a *propitiatory offering*.² The

¹ Delitzsch: We must hold fast to the following as realities: 1) that there was a demoniacal evil one, before evil had taken possession of man; 2) that the demoniacal evil one was the power of temptation before which man fell; 3) that God after mankind had fallen punished them, but at the same time opened a way of salvation, by which they could again secure communion with God; 4) that he placed before them in prospect the victory over that power of temptation through which they had lost the communion with God in Paradise. (*Messianic Prophecies*, 1891, p. 32).

On Gen. 3: 15 Delitzsch says: The entire history and order of salvation are unfolded in the protevangelium. Like a sphinx, it crouches at the entrance of sacred history. Later in the period of Israelitish Prophecy and Chokhma, the solution of this riddle of the sphinx begins to dawn; and it is only solved by Him through whom and in whom that has been revealed towards which this primitive prophecy was aimed. (*Idem*, p 37). Again: The murder of Abel by Cain is the first bruise in the heel which the seed of the woman suffers from the seed of the serpent. (*O. T. Hist. of Redemption*, p. 30).

² Abridged from Delitzsch: 1) Sacrifice in its origin is not the satisfaction of a divine command, but of an inward need; 2) the sacrifice is in all its kinds a gift, an offering. It is founded in the consecration (*sacratio*), and is completed in the oblation (*oblatio*); 3) it is the first step in the re-establishment of the original relation between man and God on the one side, and the natural world on the other, occupying with reference to both a mediatorial relation; 4) the bloody offering contains the expiatory element,

difference in the nature of the offerings was due to the difference of the employments of the two brothers; so that the reason that Abel's offering pleased God, was not that it was a *bloody* sacrifice. The reason can only be found in the *different states of heart* of the two offerers. This is indicated in Gen. 4: 3, where it is evident that Abel made choice of the best to express his gratitude, while Cain offers his gift of the fruit of the ground without selection.

At the very opening of the Bible, therefore, emphasis is laid upon *the pious disposition of the one making the sacrifice*, as the indispensable condition of its being acceptable to God (compare Heb. 11: 4).

While among the descendants of *Cain*,¹ the life of sin rises to insolent defiance (Gen. 4: 23, 24), in *Seth*, who takes the place of the murdered Abel, is propagated the race of patriarchs who seek the living God (Gen. 4: 26). Enoch² by his translation testifies of a way of life which raised him above the law of death (5: 24), and Lamech³ announces the hope of a Saviour which is wanting in the vegetable offering, and therefore takes the precedence of it; 5) every offering is worthless without the right internal state of the one bringing it. (*O. T. Hist. of Redemption*, 1881. pp. 31, 32).

¹ Cain's wife was one of his sisters, for the marriage with sisters first became incest at a later period.

² This Enoch, according to the tradition which has been put in form in the Book of Enoch, was a prophet, and according to Jude vv. 14, 15, foretold the *parousia* of the Lord in judgment. The end of Enoch's life shows that man, if he had proved true in the probation of free will, could have gone over into another stage of existence without death and corruption. . . . The translation of Enoch, as well as of Elijah, is a prophecy in act of the future end of death (Isa. 25: 8; 1 Cor. 15: 54). (*Delitzsch: Messianic Prophecies*, 1891, p. 41).

³ *Delitzsch*: Lamech's hope is directed to the ultimate comfort, and was also fulfilled in Noah, not indeed finally, but in a glorious manner, for the rainbow after the flood was a comfort, the blessing of which extended from that time on until the end. It pledged mankind, after the wrathful visitation in judgment, of the dawn of a better time, in which, instead of wrath, a blessing predominates, a time of favor, patience, and long-suffering of God (Acts

from the curse weighing on mankind as a consequence of sin (5: 29).

After the wickedness of man had reached its height by the intermarriage of the sons of God (Sethites) with the daughters of men (Cainites) (Gen. 6: 1, 2), and the time granted for repentance had passed without result, the judgment of extermination was executed in the Flood,¹ from which Noah as the righteous one (Gen. 6: 9) was saved, along with his family.²

It is the *first judgment on the world* executed by the holy God, who, according to Gen. 6: 3, will no longer permit His Spirit to be profaned by man's sin. But for Noah and his family the event means that the chosen ones shall be saved because of their *faith* in the word of threatening and promise (see Heb. 11: 7).³

[Analysis: 1) The first offering was propitiatory; 2) five points developed by Delitzsch; 3) the reason why Abel's offering pleased God; 4) what constitutes a true offering; 5) Enoch; 6) Noah, a mediator of comfort; 7) distinction between the Cainites and the Sethites; 8) their intermarriage; 9) the universality of the flood; 10) the first judgment on the world; 11) a type of baptism.]

17: 30; 14: 17; Rom. 3: 26). Noah is the first mediator of sacred history, a mediator of comfort. (*Idem*, p. 43).

¹ Delitzsch: The Biblical narrative does not demand an absolutely universal deluge. The flood was so far universal as it destroyed the entire human race then living. That was its only object. (*O. T. Hist. of Redemption*, 1881, p. 36).

² The tradition of the flood is found in several religions of antiquity; but in these traditions each religion evidently expresses a distinct idea of its own. The universality of the tradition of the flood is a powerful proof of the historical unity of the human race.

³ The flood is a type of baptism (1 Pet. 3: 21), and the ark is a type of the church.

CHAPTER II.

THE SECOND AGE OF THE WORLD.

§ 21. Covenant with the World. Noah's Saying. Division of Mankind.

The second age of the world begins with the new form taken by revelation, in presenting itself as God's covenant with man, and in the first instance, as a covenant with the *world*, in which God gives to creation a pledge of its preservation (Gen. 9: 8–17).¹

Sacrifice precedes the institution of the covenant (Gen. 8: 20),² which offering is mainly thanksgiving for the deliverance experienced, while at the same time man thereby approaches God, seeking grace for the future, after having seen the severity of God's penal justice.

The words of Noah in Gen. 9: 25–27 are of the greatest importance for the conception of the general history of mankind as given in the Old Testament,

¹ This Noachian covenant is until the present the gracious power which preserves the world, which assures the continuance of the human race; and the bow in the clouds is still the sign of the victory which grace won over wrath. . . . The Synagogue reckons seven Noachian commandments, the fulfilment of which was demanded by the so-called proselytes of the gate,—1) the prohibition of idolatry; 2) of blasphemy; 3) of incest; 4) of murder; 5) of theft; 6) of the flesh of animals which are yet alive; 7) the institution of magisterial power. Of these seven commandments, Gen. 9: 1–7 contains only the fourth, sixth, and seventh (Delitzsch: *O. T. Hist. of Redemption*, pp. 37, 38).

² **Delitzsch**: Paradise, and the presence of God upon the thresh-old of Paradise, have now vanished from the earth. The suppliant hereafter looks upward; the one bringing a sacrifice raises on high therefore a place upon the earth. The offering is called '*ola*, that which ascends'. Earth and heaven are now separated. (*Idem*, p. 37).

for here is indicated the type of development of the human race. The race of *Shem*, to whom Jehovah is God, is chosen as the bearer of divine revelation; on *Japheth* the blessing is conferred through Shem; on *Ham*, and mainly on Canaan, the curse of slavery is to press.¹

The establishment of that *world-kingdom* which is at enmity to God, proceeds from the Hamites (Gen. 10: 8–10),² whose first seat seems to have been Babel. Here begins the distinction between the kingdom of God and the kingdom of the world which runs through the whole Bible.

The *register of nations* (Gen. 10: 1–32) is intended to keep in memory the *original brotherhood of all the nations of the earth* (cf. Acts 17: 26), which are again to be united in time to come, by one blessing of God (cf. Gen. 12: 3; 18: 18; etc.).

The importance of this "*register of the nations*" can scarcely be over-estimated. The vast increase of human knowledge in recent time has proved the truth of its statements. It concerns people and not individuals, and stands at the end of grand traditional records of the mighty past, giving us a picture of the world at a time when nations and kingdoms had become settled and their boundaries fixed. The document, however, must be prior to the destruction of Sodom and Gomorrah (Gen. 10: 19). The table works backwards, and not forwards. Taking the nation at some particular time, it groups them together, and

¹ The pages of history are the best illustration of the fulfilment of these predictions.

² When the descendants of Japheth were wandering over Europe with no better weapons than implements of flint and bone, the descendants of Ham were building mighty cities,—such as Egyptian Thebes, Nineveh, and Babylon,—and founding the great empires of the East. Compare the valuable series of books published under the general title: *By Paths of Bible Knowledge*. See also *Geikie: Hours with the Bible*, vol. 1; *Weidner: Studies in Genesis*.

classifies them according to the line to which they belonged.

[Analysis: 1) The second age of the world begins with a covenant with man; 2) this covenant assures the continuance of the human race; 3) the seven Noachian commandments; 4) the significance of Noah's offering; 5) the meaning of Gen. 9: 25—27; 6) civilization first developed among the Hamites; 7) the object of the register of nations; 8) the importance and nature of this register.]

§ 22. The Foundation of a People of God.

In order to give a historical basis to the work of salvation, a people is to be chosen as the bearer of revelation. When God assigned to the nations of the earth the territory where they were to develop themselves, He had in view the place which his chosen people should afterward possess in order to fulfill their historical calling (Deut. 32: 8).¹

In connection, probably, with the mighty moving of the nations at this early period, the Terahites leave the ancestral dwelling-place of the Chaldeans in northern Assyria and wander first to Haran in northern Mesopotamia (Gen. 11: 31). Here, where idolatry, designated as the worship of Teraphim, begins to break out even in this family (Josh. 24: 2; Gen. 31: 19), the basis of the Old Testament dispensation is laid by the calling of Abram (Gen. 12: 1). While the nations of the earth walk in their own ways, in which they develop their natural peculiarities, an *everlasting* people is to be founded in Abram's descendants (Isa. 44: 7), which in its peculiar national type is to be not a product of natural development, but of the creative power and grace of God (Deut. 32: 6). It is only in this *idea of the people of God* that the key is given to the Old Testament history, which would

¹ This passage refers to the division of the nations as given in Gen. 11: 1—9.

otherwise remain an insoluble riddle.¹ The view that the Old Testament dispensation is a natural production of religious genius of the people of Israel must be absolutely rejected.

[Analysis: 1) A special nation was chosen as a bearer of salvation; 2) the wandering of the Babylonian Shemites; 3) the call of Abraham; 4) the Old Testament religion is not to be regarded as a natural growth of the Semitic character.]

¹ Delitzsch: The call of Abram had in view a family of God, and in this family a people of God, and in this people the God-man. The ethical character of the new beginning is determined by this. (*O. T. Hist. of Redemption*, p. 43).

CHAPTER III.

THE TIME OF THE PATRIARCHS.

§ 23. Abraham.

Obedient to the divine call, Abram leaves Mesopotamia, accompanied by Lot, the ancestor of the Moabites and Ammonites, to go to Canaan, which is already (Gen. 12: 6) possessed by the tribes bearing this name. In solemn revelation God closes with him the covenant of promise (Gen. 15: 1-21), and Abram, several years later, takes upon himself the obligations of the covenant through circumcision (Gen. 17: 1-27).

Three points are contained in the promises given to Abram (Gen. 12: 2, 3, 7; 13: 15, 16; 17: 5-8; 22: 16-18): 1) Unto him is to be given for an everlasting possession to his descendants, all the land of Canaan; 2) He who remains childless till his old age shall have an innumerable posterity; 3) In his seed shall all the earth be blessed.

Abraham, by his faith, which is reckoned to him for righteousness, becomes the father of all believers (cf. Rom. 4 and Gal. 3), and his name stands at the head of the three monotheistic religions of the world (Jewish, Christian, and Mohammedan) even when looked at in a purely historical way.

The character of God's people is *ethically determined from the first*, and Gen. 18: 19 shows that not all natural descendants belong to the true sons of Abraham and to the heirs of the promise.

On the relation of the religion of the patriarchs to the surrounding heathenism, the narratives in Gen. 14: 18—22 and Chap. 22 shed the most important light. The former passage contains the story of *Melchizedek*, king of Salem. This Salem is without doubt Jerusalem, and Abraham in the way which he does homage to Melchizedek manifestly acknowledges the God whose priest Melchizedek is. We have here traces of an older purer monotheism on Canaanitish ground, which at first sight is remarkable, because elsewhere the relation of the Old Testament God to the Canaanitish religion is sharply antagonistic. No doubt we have here a remnant of an older and pure religion, preserved in the midst of the Canaanitish religion by a Semitic race dwelling among Canaanites.

Abraham accepted from Salem's priest and king, Melchizedek, not only bread and wine for the invigoration of his exhausted warriors, but a priestly blessing also, and gave him in return the tenth of all his booty, as a sign that he acknowledged this king as a priest of the living God, and that he submitted to his royal priesthood. And although we can see in Melchizedek nothing more than one, perhaps the last of the witnesses and confessors of the early revelation of God, coming out into the light of history from the dark night of heathenism; yet this appearance does point to a priesthood of universal significance, and to a higher order of things, which existed at the commencement of the world, and is one day to be restored again. In all these respects, the noble form of this King of Salem and Priest of the Most High God was a type of the God-King and eternal High Priest. Jesus Christ; a thought which is expanded in Heb. 7, on the basis of this account, and of the divine utterance revealed to David in the Spirit, that the king of Zion

sitting on the right hand of Jehovah should be a priest forever after the order of Melchizedek (Ps. 110: 4).¹

With reference to the second narrative, *the temptation of Abraham*, Kurtz in his *History of the Old Covenant*, seems to have given the right explanation. He says: "Abraham must have been conscious that the way that led to the perfecting of his faith was the way of renunciation and self-denial. The sight of the Canaanite sacrifices of children must have led Abraham to self-examination, whether he would be strong enough in renunciation and self-denial to do what those heathen did, if his God desired it from him. But if the question was once made the subject of discussion in Abraham's heart, it had also to be brought to a definite and real decision." But the remarks of Keil in his *Commentary* are equally true: "The command to offer up his only son Isaac did not come from Abraham's own heart,—was not a thought suggested by the sight of the human sacrifices of the Canaanites, that he would offer a similar sacrifice to his God; nor did it originate with the tempter to evil. The word came from *Ha-Elohim*, the personal true God, who tried him, who demanded the sacrifice of the only, beloved son, as a proof and attestation of his faith. The issue, however, shows, that God did not desire the sacrifice of Isaac by slaying and burning him upon the altar, but his complete surrender, and a willingness to offer him up to God even by death." Oehler makes the following deductions from this point of view: The culminating point of worship in the religions of nature was human sacrifice. The covenant had to separate itself in this respect from heathenism; the truth in it had to be acknowledged,

¹ See Keil in his *Commentary* on Gen. 14: 18—22.

and the falsehood denied. In the command to offer up Isaac, the truth of the conviction that human life must be sacrificed as an unholy thing, is acknowledged; and by the arresting intervention of God, the hideous distortion of this truth which had arisen in heathenism is condemned and rejected.

[Analysis: 1) The covenant with Abraham; 2) three points are contained in the promises to Abraham; 3) Abraham, the father of all believers; 4) Melchizedek; 5) a type of Christ; 6) the significance of the temptation of Abraham.]

§ 24. Isaac and Jacob.

Very little is recorded of the life of Isaac; he walked in the footsteps of his father, and the divine promises given to the latter were renewed to him (Gen. 26: 2-5). Of his twin-sons, Jacob, the second-born son, was chosen as the bearer of the promise (Rom. 9: 11). The fundamental thought connected with the divine guidance of Jacob's life is, that in spite of all human hindrances, the divine counsel reaches its goal, and that even human sins must serve for its realization, although they are punished none the less. By the sin of Jacob and his mother, Isaac's purpose, which was in opposition to the promise to Jacob (Gen. 25: 23), is thwarted; yet Jacob's sin is visited on him in the straits he experienced in his wanderings (Gen. 27: 42-45), which were occasioned by his artifice against Esau,¹ and particularly in the sorrows afterwards prepared for him by his sons, when he who himself had preached deception must himself in a like manner be deceived. The covenant promise given to

¹ Delitzsch: Jacob received the four-fold blessing of the first-born; 1) The possession of the land of Canaan under the divine benediction (Gen. 27: 27, 28); 2) the subjection of nations (27: 29 a); 3) the primacy over his brothers (27: 29 b); 4) the highest position in redemptive history,—so that blessings and curses are conditioned by the attitude which men take to him. (*Messianic Prophecies* 1891, p. 48).

him at the beginning of his journey to Mesopotamia, in the theophany at Bethel, in order to strengthen him for the years of exile (Gen. 28: 10–15), is confirmed at the same place on his return (Gen. 35: 9–15), after he had gained for himself and his race in the night-long wrestling at Jabbok, which forms the turning-point of his life, the new and holy name of *Israel*, characteristic of his divine calling (Gen 32: 24–28). It is common, especially in the practical use of this latter passage, to limit one's self to seeing in Jacob's struggle a symbol of wrestling in prayer, which does not become wearied until it wins the blessing. But it is better to distinguish a two-fold wrestling. Jacob's combat, when he *first wrestles with bodily strength*, is perhaps a picture of the perverseness of his former life, and his becoming lame is then meant to show that God does not permit Himself to be forced by natural strength. But then Jacob becomes victorious by the *weapon of prayer* (Hos. 12: 4, 5).

[Analysis: 1) Isaac; 2) the lesson of Jacob's life; 3) his sins visited upon him; 4) receives a four-fold blessing; 5) the theophany at Bethel; 6) the name Israel: 7) the significance of Jacob's wrestling with the Angel.]

§ 25. The Twelve Patriarchs.

That there are *twelve* tribes is explained by the Old Testament from the number of the sons of Jacob. A long period of expectation in exile and slavery is first prescribed (Gen. 15: 13, 14) to Jacob's descendants before they enter upon their possession of the land of Canaan. The completion of the divine decree is introduced by the providential history of Joseph. Jacob dies in Egypt after having predicted the future of the tribes descending from his sons, in his prophetic blessing (Gen. 49), which looks far beyond the time in which his descendants continue strangers. The twelve

tribes are here portrayed, partly according to their geographical relationship, while at the same time Jacob's words rest on ethical and psychological considerations.¹ With regard to the *theological meaning* of these sayings, it is taught by this blessing, that in the divine kingdom things do not occur in the way of nature, but according to divine choice. Neither he who should have taken the lead by right of birth, nor yet the father's darling, is called to stand at the head of the Kingdom of God.

Among the twelve Joseph is especially prominent, who is to become a mighty double tribe in his two sons Manasseh and Ephraim (Gen. 48: 5). It is Judah, on the other hand, who is especially chosen as the bearer of the promise.

[Analysis: 1) Why twelve tribes? 2) the history of Joseph; 3) the significance of Jacob's prophetic blessing; 4) Judah, the bearer of the promise.]

¹ Herder: Jacob's mind is strengthened from heaven to note the slumbering destiny in the soul of his sons, and to open this hidden book of their separate traits of character and action.

CHAPTER IV.

THE TIME OF MOSES AND JOSHUA.

§ 26. Condition of the People of Israel in Egypt.

At the close of the time of the Patriarchs, the biblical account passes silently over a long period, in which Israel grows up into a people. The simple tribal life, such as we must suppose Israel's to have been in those centuries, really forms no history.

The Old Testament gives us some intimations of the condition of the people in Egypt. They seem, on the whole, to have kept to the pastoral life of their fathers in Goshen. As the Egyptians and Israelites lived together (Ex. 3: 22; 12: 33-36), the people could not have remained unaffected by the Egyptian culture, which was at that time already very far advanced, and it is a mistake to regard the Israelites at their Exodus from Egypt as a rude race of nomads, in whom we may not presuppose even the smallest beginning of culture. They appear in the Pentateuch as an *unmanageable*, but not as an *uncultured* people. The political organization of the people had developed itself in a genealogical way, which corresponds to the natural character of the Semites, who are characterized by strong family attachment. With regard to the *religious condition* of the nation, we find that among the mass of the people the remembrance of the God of their fathers, and of the promises given to them, had to be awakened. The purer worship of God which we find among the patriarchs had been

displaced by *idol-worship*, as may be concluded partly from express testimony (Josh. 24: 14; Ezek. 20: 7-9; 23: 8, 19), and partly from the idol-worship to which the people gave themselves during their wandering in the wilderness (the worship of the calf at Sinai, Ex. 32; the service of the he-goats, Lev. 17: 7; the service of the fire-god Moloch, Lev. 18: 21; 20: 2). There is no ground whatever for the view that the Israelitish monotheism was developed from a lower stage of natural religion.

[Analysis: 1) Israel grows up into a nation in Egypt; 2) the Israelites were not an uncultured people; 3) their religious condition; 4) addicted to idol-worship.]

§ 27. The Course of Deliverance from Egypt.

The deliverance from Egypt is related in the book of Exodus. The divine instrument for this was Moses. What Moses failed to do when trying in his own might, he was to accomplish forty years after as an instrument in God's hand. The ten plagues which are sent on the Egyptians (Ex. 7-12, compared with Ps. 78: 43-51; 106: 21, 22) are mostly connected with natural events and conditions which frequently recur in Egypt. The order of their succession stands in close connection with the natural course of the Egyptian year. But partly the severity of the plagues, and partly their connection with the word of Moses (Ex. 8: 5, 6), make them signs of Jehovah's power. The plagues rise from step to step until, after the tenth plague (the killing of the first-born of the Egyptians, which takes place the same night as the substitution of the Pass-over in Israel), the Egyptians, full of fear, drive the people from the land.¹ Because the people are not

¹ The passages in Ex. 3: 21, 22; 11: 2, 3; 12: 35, 36, have been celebrated on account of misinterpretation and mistranslation. No robbery is here implied, but a simple taking away. The Revised

yet matured for war with the nations of Canaan, Moses does not lead them to Canaan by the nearest road, but chooses the round-about way through the wilderness of Sinai. Their faith was tested at the passage of the Red Sea (Ex. 14).¹

[Analysis: 1) Moses, the deliverer of Israel; 2) the ten plagues; 3) the Passover; 4) the length of Israel's sojourn.]

§ 28. The Educational Aim of the March through the Wilderness. The Covenant of the Law established.

The people, scarcely escaped from the rod of correction, from the flesh-pots and idols of Egypt, must be educated, sifted, and purified for their calling; and this educational aim is secured by the march through the wilderness, where the people are thrown entirely on their God, where they become aware of their need of help through want and privation, and are to be exercised in obedience and trust; and to prove at the same time, in the experience of the divine leading and help, what they have in their God (Deut. 8: 2—5, 14—18). In Hos. 2: 16, the future restoration of Israel

English Version translates correctly. The sense of the passages is, that the Egyptians are glad to get rid of the Israelites at this price, so that we have here an act of remuneration, that the children of Israel might receive at least some compensation for all their labor and suffering.

¹ A difficult question here arises, whether we are to make the duration of the sojourn in Egypt from the entrance of Jacob into Egypt 215 years, or 430 years. The Hebrew text in Ex. 12: 40, 41 compared with Gen. 15: 13 seems to make the duration 430 years, while St. Paul in Gal. 3: 17 favors the shorter period, which appears to be the true solution. Not only Hellenistic tradition, but also Palestinian, testifies that the sojourn of the Israelites in Egypt lasted 215 years. Much may be said on both sides, and the best critics are divided on this question. Egyptian history can not aid us in the solution on account of the extreme uncertainty of its chronology, and to this day Egyptologists are not agreed as to the date of the 18th dynasty within two centuries (specialists giving dates ranging from 1703 B. C. to 1520 B. C.), nor as to its duration within a century (Brugsch assigns to it 300 years; Mariette, 241; Bunsen, 221; Wilkinson, 196).

is represented as a new guidance through the wilderness. In the third month (Ex. 19: 1), on the first of the month, the people reached Sinai, where Jehovah, as the Holy One, founds the theocracy and enters on His *Kingship*. Then follows the promulgation of the fundamental law by which Jehovah binds Israel's race to a holy constitution. By the *covenant offering* (Ex. 24), the entrance of the people into communion with the Holy God is sealed. With regard to grace and judgment, Israel is from this time forward the privileged people of God.

[Analysis: 1) Israel must be purified; 2) significance of their march through the wilderness; 3) the giving of the law; 4) the significance of the covenant offering.]

§ 29. The First Breach of the Covenant. Order of the Camp. Departure from Sinai. Sentence on the People.

The people soon break the covenant by falling into idolatry in the absence of Moses (Ex. 32: 1-6). Moses executes judgment on the idolaters, and on this occasion the tribe of Levi obtains its consecration (Ex. 32: 26-29). One of the most beautiful sections of the Pentateuch, in which Moses appears in all his greatness, is the story of his offering himself as *anathema*, if God will only forgive the people,—a thought which has been uttered by only one other than Moses, namely Paul (Rom. 9: 3).¹ During the stay at Sinai, which was for about a year, the holy tabernacle is set up and dedicated, the ordinances of worship are regulated, and a number of the laws are given.² Finally, the order of encampment is fixed,

¹ In Genesis we have a mediatorial intervention, when Abraham wishes to intervene for Sodom and Gomorrah; but more remarkable is the intervention of Moses, who proposes to be blotted out of the book of Life.

² According to the negative Higher Critics the tabernacle is a pure fiction of the post-exilic period, a false position which we cannot here discuss.

by which the relation of Jehovah to the people as His army, and at the same time their relation to each other, are distinctly expressed (Num. 2 and 3).

In the second year, on the twentieth of the month, the removal from Sinai takes place. They succeed, under repeated outbreaks of their stiffneckedness and chastisements suffered on this account, in reaching Kadesh-Barnea, the southern boundary of Canaan. From this point Moses causes the land to be searched by twelve spies. The accounts which they bring back raise a general insurrection. A wandering of forty years long in the wilderness is decreed against the people, during which time the whole body of men who were capable of war is to be swept away, except Joshua and Caleb, who had no share in the offense (Num. 14). Hence the history of the march through the wilderness is treated as a type of warning for all times (Ps. 78; 1 Cor. 10: 1-12; Heb. 3: 7-11).

Analysis: 1) The first breach of the covenant; 2) the tribe of Levi obtains its consecration; 3) Moses as mediator; 4) the erection of the tabernacle; 5) the order of the camp; 6) march from Sinai; 7) the twelve spies; 8) the rebellion; 9) the punishment; 10) the march a type of warning for all time.]

§ 30. The Wandering during Thirty-seven Years in the Wilderness, and the Events up to the Occupation of the Land on the east side of Jordan.

The history of the Pentateuch passes over the following *thirty-seven years* almost wholly in silence. According to Deut. 1: 46, a long stay of the people in Kadesh must be presupposed. The seventeen places of encampment which are mentioned in Num. 33: 19-36 between Rithmah and Kadesh are those at which the Israelites pitched their camps during the thirty-seven years of wandering in the wilderness. In the first month of the fortieth year, the people are

again in Kadesh-Barnea. The new-grown race shows the same stubbornness as the earlier one; they contend with Moses and Aaron; and as at this time even the faith of these two wavers, to them also entrance into the land of rest is denied (Num. 20: 10–12).¹ A new outbreak of the people's stubbornness draws upon them another chastisement. The brazen *saraph* (a fiery serpent) which was suspended, is a symbol of the doing away of evil through the power and grace of God (Num. 21: 4–9). To this the typical use in John 3: 14 attaches itself. Then follow, in the land on the east side of the Jordan, successful combats, as a testimony of Jehovah's faithfulness and a pledge of future victory. Especially interesting is the history of Balaam and Balak (Num. 22: 1–24: 25). It is in this connection that the well-known prophetic passage concerning the star and sceptre arising out of Israel, occurs (Num. 24: 17–19).² The new numbering of the people, which was made in the plains of Moab (Num. 26), shows the new-grown race to be numerically almost the same as before (601,730 men fit for war, against 603,550).

[Analysis: 1) The 37 years of wandering; 2) the people arrive again at Kadesh-Barnea; 3) guilty of stubbornness; 4) the sin of Moses and Aaron; 5) the significance of the brazen serpent; 6) the history of Balaam; 7) the famous prophecy, Num. 24: 17–19.]

§ 31. Deuteronomy. Death of Moses. His position among the Organs of Revelation.

The people's wandering is completed, and Moses is to place the staff of leadership in Joshua's hands. The

¹ The lesson of the narrative is, that unbroken obedience was demanded by God from his chosen instruments, and that they were thus punished as a warning to the people.

² The oracles of Balaam are divided into four sections, which unroll the future history of the kingdom of God in its relation to the kingdoms of the world.

last testament of the departing leader to his people is given in Deuteronomy. This, although one of the most disputed books in the Old Testament, is one of the most beautiful.¹ When Moses has finished blessing his people, he mounts to the top of Pisgah, in order to cast yet one look on the longed-for land, and appears no more on earth. His end is related in a mysterious way, but is indicated by the same expressions as the common end of man's life (Deut. 34: 5, 7; compared with Deut. 32: 50).²

The position of Moses as divinely ordained to exercise all the powers of the theocracy, is a unique one, which did not descend to Joshua, who had only to execute inherited commands, and administer a law already given. Joshua is simply a leader, and has no other theocratic power.

[Analysis: 1) The last will of Moses given in Deuteronomy; 2) this beautiful book one of the most disputed; 3) the mysterious death of Moses; 4) his position a unique one.]

¹ The view of some modern critics, that the finding of the book of the law at the repairing of the temple under Josiah, in the year 624 B. C. (2 Kings 22), was in truth the publication of Deuteronomy, which was only written a short time before, is contrary to the fact that **even the oldest prophets** presuppose Deuteronomy, its legislative provisions, and also its speeches. But the examination of the critical question of Deuteronomy, must be left to Old Testament Introduction.

² There are two men in the O. T. of whom it is not said that they died,—Enoch and Elijah. The Jewish legends sought to give Moses a place beside these two persons. The position of the New Testament to the death of Moses is peculiar. While Heb. 11: 40 says of the Old Covenant fathers, "that apart from us they should not be made perfect," making their **perfection** dependent on the completion of the New Testament work of redemption,—the New Testament history of the transfiguration, where Moses appears with Elijah, Matt. 17: 3; Luke 9: 30, 31, presupposes Moses as perfected for the heavenly life. If justice is done to all the passages, we must say with Stier: "A wonderful exception is made with the bodies of these two from the common lot of death; although the lawgiver actually died on account of sin, and the prophet was already more nearly raised to the victory over death" (Oehler).

§ 32. Occupation of Canaan. Extermination of the Canaanites.

The passage of Jordan ensued in a miraculous way, as a pledge to the people that the same mighty God who was with Moses would reveal himself also under the new leader (Josh. 4: 14, 22-24), and therefore this event is expressly placed side by side with the march through the Red Sea (Josh. 4: 23; Ps. 114: 3, 5). The key to the land was won by the conquest of Jericho (Josh. 6). The *cherem* (ban, devotion as a curse), enjoined in Deut. 7: 2; 20: 16-18, was executed on a number of Canaanitish towns. The Old Testament knows no other ground for the assignment of the land to Israel than the free grace of Jehovah, to whom it belonged; and no other ground for the blotting out of the Canaanite tribes than the divine justice which, after these tribes have filled up the measure of their sins in unnatural abominations (Deut. 12: 31), breaks in at last in vengeance, after long waiting. But Israel is threatened with exactly the same judgment (Deut. 8: 19, 20; Josh. 23: 15, 16) if it become guilty of the sins of the tribes on whom it executes the divine judgment with the sword.¹

[Analysis: 1) The miraculous passage of the Jordan; 2) the conquest of Jericho; 3) the *Cherem*; 4) the reason Canaan was given to Israel; 5) the reason assigned for the extermination of the Canaanites.]

§ 33. Division of the Land. Character of the Promised Land. Israel at the Close of this Period.

In the seventh year after their entrance (Josh. 14: 10), the Israelites began the division of the land, although it was not yet in all parts completely van-

¹ The extermination of the Canaanites has been defended in many cases on very doubtful grounds. The view presented above is alone in accordance with the Old Testament. It is quite unnecessary to add any artificial apologetical considerations.

quished (Josh. 13: 2-6). Eleazar the priest, and Joshua, with the chiefs of the tribes, managed the business of division.¹ The division of the land was carried out so that not merely the limits of the tribal territories were fixed, but inside these also the districts of the families. Thus the life of tribe and family remained the basis of civil society. The separation from the other peoples commanded in the law (see especially Lev. 20: 24, 26) was made easier by the secluded position of the land, which was enclosed on the south and east by great wildernesses, on the north by the high mountains of Lebanon, and which even on the west was unfavorably situated for maritime intercourse. On the other hand, by the situation of the land in the midst of the cultivated nations which figure in ancient history, as well as by means of the great highways of the old world which led past its borders, the future theocratic calling of the people was made possible. A first consequence of the position of Israel in the midst of nations was, that it courted the powers of the world, and was chastised by all, so that all became instruments of judgment on Israel. But on the other side, it was this central position which made this land fit for the starting-point of the religion of the world.

Two parts of the promise given to the patriarchs were fulfilled—the entrance of Israel into their rest in the promised land, and the increase of the people like the stars of heaven (Deut. 10: 22). But the dominion over the nations (Gen. 27: 29; 49: 10) was not yet obtained, the blessing of Abraham was not yet come to the heathen; nay, a new cycle of history must arise in which centuries of contest for mere existence were ordained for the people.

[Analysis: 1) The division of the land; 2) its secluded position; 3) and yet central; 4) the promise given to the patriarchs partly fulfilled.]

¹ The second part of the Book of Joshua is of immense value for **Biblical Geography**.

SECTION II.

THE DOCTRINES OF MOSAISM.

§ 34. Survey.

The general subject of the Doctrines and Ordinances of Mosaism will be discussed under the following heads:

1. The Doctrines of Mosaism.
 - 1) The Mosaic doctrine of God.
 - 2) The Mosaic doctrine of the Creation and Preservation of the world.
 - 3) The Mosaic doctrine of Divine Providence.
 - 4) The Mosaic doctrine of Revelation.
 - 5) The Mosaic doctrine of the Nature of man.
 - 6) The Mosaic doctrine of Death and the State after Death.
2. The Ordinances of Mosaism.
 - 1) The Divine Election.
 - 2) Man's Obligation.
 - 3) Divine Retribution.
3. The Theocracy.
 - 1) Theocratic Organization of the People.
 - 2) The Theocratic Authority.
 - 3) The Organization of the Family.
4. The Mosaic Public Worship.
 - 1) The Place of Worship.
 - 2) The Actions of Worship.
 - 3) The Times of Worship.

CHAPTER V.

THE MOSAIC DOCTRINE OF GOD.

§ 35. Survey.

The most general designations of the Divine Being are *El, Eloah, Elohim, El-Elyon*, which names are also made use of outside of the religion of the Old Testament. By these names Genesis gives only the general characteristics of the divine nature. It is a mistake to bring the theological divisions of a later period into Biblical Theology, and to treat God's attributes according to a preconceived scheme. Biblical Theology traces the religion of revelation in its rise and development, and finds for the definition of the idea of God a gradually advancing series of statements concerning the divine essence. But in these stages the idea of God is so unfolded that the higher stages do not destroy the lower, but embrace them.

The divine name *El-Shaddai* is the first that leads into the sphere of revelation, but the divine name which properly belongs to the Old Testament revelation is *Yahwe, Jehovah*.

Analysis: 1) The most general names of God; 2) there is a progress in revelation; 3) *El-Shaddai*; 4) *Jehovah*.]

§ 36. The Names *El, Eloah, Elohim, El-Elyon*.

1) *El* is the oldest Semitic name of God.¹ As a name of the true God, it is not frequent in the prose of the

¹ **Schultz:** The O. T. nowhere felt the need of proving the existence of God. . . The very existence of the religion of Israel was, in fact, a proof of it. . . It could no more wish to prove the existence of God than an ordinary man feels the need of proving that he himself exists (vol. 2, pp. 100, 101).

Old Testament. It hardly ever appears except with the article, or in connection with a following genitive, or an attribute annexed in some other way. Its original sense is "the powerful, the strong." The name *EI* also appears in a number of the oldest names of men (Gen. 4: 18, Mehuja-el, Methusha-el).

2) *Eloah*, the singular of *Elohim*, occurs in the Old Testament almost exclusively in *poetical* language, with the exception of the later books composed under Aramaic influence. It originally expresses the *impression* made by power. *Eloah* is, according to this, the power that awakens terror. That the natural man finds himself, when confronted by the Divinity, chiefly moved by a feeling of fear, is expressed in this designation of God.

3) The most common designation of the Divine Being in the Old Testament is *Elohim*, the plural of *Eloah*. This plural form is peculiar to the Old Testament, and it appears as a name of God only in old Hebrew, and in none of the other Semitic languages. The meaning of the plural is not *numerical*, either in the sense in which some older theologians understand it, who seek the mystery of the Trinity in the name;¹ or in the sense that the expression had originally a *polytheistic* meaning, and only at a later period acquired a singular sense; or that originally the plural indicated the one God together with the angels; but it is much better to explain *Elohim*, as the *quantitative* plural, which is used to denote unlimited greatness. The plural signifies the *infinite fulness* of the might and power which lies in the Divine Being, and thus passes over into the *intensive plural*, as Delitzsch has named

¹ But even this view has some truth at its foundation, since the plural form, indicating the inexhaustible fulness of the Divinity, serves to combat the most daring enemy of the doctrine of the Trinity—abstract monotheism.

it.¹ The plural contained in *Adonai* is to be explained in the same way; indeed, this plural of majesty has also passed to other titles of God. *Elohim* remains all through the Old Testament the general name of God; and is used with special emphasis in the Elohistie Psalms.

As the name of the *true* God, *Elohim* is regularly *joined with the singular*. The exceptions are rare, and can be explained from the context of the passages.

Elohim is God in his omnipotence, and as such He is the God of the Gentiles also. He is designated *Elohim* as the one who is in the highest degree to be feared and revered, as absolute majesty and power.

4) The divine name *El-Elyon (God Most High)* is also used outside of the sphere of revelation. It occurs in the history of Melchizedek (Gen. 14: 18), and it is characteristic that it appears in the mouth of the king of Babylon (Isa. 14: 14), probably to designate Bel.

[Analysis: 1) The meaning of El; 2) the O. T. takes the existence of God for granted; 3) the meaning of Eloah; 4) the significance of the plural form Elohim; 5) the definition of Schultz; 6) the significance of Elohim; 7) of El-Elyon.]

1 Schultz: It is one of those plural forms by no means rare in the case of words denoting power and majesty, which help to increase the significance of the word, and to express the fulness of power and majesty which is exclusively connected with unity of person. Probably the significance of the word does not depend directly on the idea of the strength, but on the notion of that which is terrible, majestic, and adorable. . . . When the God of Israel is called Elohim, He is thereby simply described as Deity, as possessor of a nature which is absolutely sublime, and to which obedience and adoration are due from mortals (Vol. 2, pp. 126, 127).

§ 37. El-Shaddai.

This name characterizes God as *revealing Himself in His might*.¹ Delitzsch on Gen. 17: 1 forcibly says: "*Elohim* is the God who creates nature so that it is, and supports it so that it continues; *El-Shaddai*, the God who compels nature to do what is contrary to itself, and subdues it to bow and minister to grace." But as soon as the name *Jehovah* unfolds its meaning, the name El-Shaddai falls back on the one hand into the list of the more general names of God.

[Analysis: 1) The meaning of El-Shaddai: 2) in what it differs from Elohim.]

§ 38. Pronunciation and Grammatical Explanation of the Name Jehovah.²

The word *Jehovah* in the Masoretic text of the Old Testament has the vowel pointing of *Adonai*.³ How old the dread of uttering the name is, cannot be accurately fixed. The Jews maintain that the knowledge of the true pronunciation has been entirely lost since the destruction of the temple. Ex. 3: 13—15 is the decisive passage for the pronunciation and grammatical explanation of the name. We must read either *Jahweh* or Jahwah. The first form is more probable, and we must regard the word as a noun

¹ **Schultz:** This word is meant to denote God as the absolutely mighty one whom no one can withstand, so that his followers may fearlessly and confidently trust in him, and build their faith upon him (vol. 2, p. 130).

² See **Dalman:** *Studien zur biblischen Theologie,—der Gottesname Adonai und seine Geschichte.* Berlin 1889.

³ **Schultz:** The history of the pronunciation of this word is singularly obscure. . . . The name "Jahve" was regarded by the later age as a **secret** name of miraculous virtue, and as too holy to be pronounced. . . . The growth of this awe, based perhaps on Lev. 24: 11, 16, can still be traced in the old Rabbinic literature. . . . Even tradition throws little light on the original pronunciation (vol. 2, pp. 131, 132).

formed from the third person of the imperfect of *hawah*, the older form of *hayah* (*he was*).¹

[Analysis: 1) Pronunciation of the name Jehovah; 2) grammatical explanation].

§ 39. The Signification of the Name Jehovah.

The name signifies *He who is*, according to Ex. 3: 14; more particularly, *He who is what He is*. God is *Jahweh* in as far as he has entered into an *historical* relation to mankind, and in particular to the chosen people, Israel.

1) The name carries us into the sphere of divine *freedom*. It expresses quite generally the absolute *independence* of God in His dominion.

2) The name further conveys the idea of the absolute *immutability* of God (Mal. 3: 6), and implies the invariable *faithfulness* of God (Deut. 7: 9; Isa. 26: 4).

[Analysis: 1) Literal signification of Jahweh; 2) the name more particularly expresses two ideas.]

§ 40. Age and Origin of the Name Jehovah.

Every attempt to derive the name from heathenism rests on arbitrary hypotheses. The more exact determination of the Old Testament origin of the name, depends on the explanation of the passage in Ex. 6: 3. We are not to explain this as if the name Jehovah had been entirely *unknown* to the patriarchs, and that we have here the *first revelation* of the name; but rather in this sense, that the name Jehovah had not

¹ **Schultz:** According to Hebrew etymology the word must undoubtedly be connected with *hayah* in its older form *hawah*. . . But the view of Schrader and Lagarde appears to me still more suitable. . . . They would refer it to a secondary conjugation and take the Hiphil as the original form. Then Jahve would be "he who causes to be," the Creator; or if the signification *being* is only the weakened form of the stronger "living," then "the bestower of life." . . . But even this view cannot be termed certain (vol. 2, pp. 133, 134).

been yet understood by the patriarchs, and that they had not had the *full experience* of that which lies in the name.¹ The name, therefore, reaches back to primeval antiquity, and was not first introduced by Moses.²

[Analysis: 1) The name Jehovah not of heathen origin; 2) not entirely unknown to the patriarchs; 3) though its full meaning was not known to them; 4) the meaning of Ex. 6: 3; 5) five reasons to prove the pre-Mosaic origin of the name.]

§ 41. Comparison of the Name Jehovah with Elohim and El.

In general, all universally cosmical action of God, going out toward the heathen as well as toward Israel in the creation and preservation of the world, is traced to *El* and *Elohim*; to *Jehovah*, on the other hand, is traced every divine act which is connected with the theocratic revelation and guidance, and which bears on the heathen only in so far as their history stands in relation to the aim of the divine kingdom. This difference, however, from the nature of the case, is not strictly kept up everywhere in the Old Testament in the use of the names of God. But still it is plainly apparent that the Old Testament writers had a very definite consciousness of the indicated difference.³

¹ This would make the meaning of the passage correspond exactly with Ex. 3: 15, and be analogous to the passage Ex. 33: 19.

² In favor of this view we may present the following reasons:

1) The name occurs in some of the most ancient documents inserted by Moses into the Book of Genesis; 2) the occurrence of proper names compounded with *Jah* in Pre-Mosaic genealogies (Azariah, 1 Chron. 2: 8; Abiah, 1 Chron. 2: 24; Ahijah, 1 Chron. 2: 25; Jochebed, the mother of Moses); 3) Abraham used it as an element in a name, Gen. 22: 14; 4) it is most improbable that Moses should bring to the people a revelation of the God of their fathers under a name of God *quite unknown* to them; 5) even Schultz, an expounder of the negative critical theory, grants that "it is in itself more likely that such a name was not *invented* but simply *found* by Moses" (vol. 2, p. 137).

³ It is well known that the first book of Psalms (Ps. 1—41) is *Jehovistic*, and the second (Ps. 42—72), *Elohistic*.

Theophany in general is predicated of Jehovah, who, and not Elohim, holds intercourse with man in the manner of men. Hence it comes that anthropomorphisms are almost always applied to Jehovah, and not to Elohim.

[Analysis: 1) God is Elohim as his power is displayed in the creation and preservation of the world; 2) Jehovah as the Redeeming God; 3) theophany is predicated of Jehovah.]

§ 42. Attributes of God which are derived immediately from the Idea of Jehovah.

1) Jehovah is an *eternal* God, the *Everlasting God*, as Abraham addresses Him in Gen. 21: 33 (compare Deut. 32: 40). God's eternity is involved in His absolute independence, in virtue whereof God is not conditioned by anything which originates or decays in time, but is the first and the last (Isa. 44: 6; 48: 12). While God as *Jehovah* is the eternal, God's eternity is defined as the *unchangeableness of His being, continuing throughout every change of time* and thus it becomes the basis of human confidence.¹

2) In the word *Jehovah* is involved the idea that He is a *living* God (Gen. 16: 14; Deut. 5: 26).² He is acknowledged as the living God in the midst of the

Delitzsch: "While Elohim is the more especially appropriate name of the Creator, *Jehovah* designates more particularly the God of history, and indeed of the history of Redemption, hence God the Redeemer. The combination of the two names denotes, according to Ps. 100: 3, the oneness of the supermundane God and the God of history, the oneness of God the Creator and the God of Israel, or the God of positive revelation!" (Comm. on Gen. 2: 4).

¹ Schultz: In the O. T. conception of God, nothing stands out from the first so strongly and unmistakably as the *personality* of the God of Israel The God of the O. T. is thoroughly self-conscious, independent of the world, free, personal. The writer of Ex. 3: 14 takes the very name of the covenant God, Jehovah, to mean that he is unchangeable self-existence, absolute personality (vol. 2, p. 103).

² On Gen. 16: 13 see my *Studies in Genesis*.

congregation by his deeds of revelation (Josh. 3: 10), and by his words of revelation (Jer. 23: 36). As a living God he also enters with man into a relation of fellowship which is experienced by him inwardly, especially as a God who hears prayer, and hence the longing of the godly for the living God (Ps. 42: 2; 84: 2).¹

3) Jehovah is the *Lord*,—my Lord (*Adonai*). According to the original meaning of *Adonai* ("my Lord"), there lies in it, not simply the acknowledgment of the divine sovereignty in general, but also the consciousness of specially belonging to God, the consciousness of standing under his immediate guidance and protection.²

[Analysis: 1) Jehovah is the eternal God; 2) the name implies His independence, 3) His unchangeableness; 4) His absolute personality; 5) the idea of the living God; 6) the meaning of *Adonai*.]

§ 43. The Unity of God.

Monotheism forms one of the fundamental doctrines of Mosaism. *Jehovah is one* (Deut. 6: 4).

1) Some have maintained that *the unity of God was developed gradually from a polytheistic religion*, but for this there is no evidence whatever.³ Passages like Gen. 1: 27; 11: 7; 3: 22, cannot be cited in support of this view.

2) Others again maintain that *the Mosaic Jehovah does not exclude the existence of other gods*.

¹ **Schultz:** He is the living God, the God of life, in whom life is present as a property, and that, too, an inalienable property (Deut. 5: 26; 32: 40; Jer. 10: 10). (Vol. 2, p. 112).

² **Schultz:** *Adonai* describes God as the Master to whom man stands in the relation of a servant, Gen. 18: 27. (Vol. 2, p. 129).

³ The whole exhibition of the Divine Being in the first ten chapters of Genesis assumes most distinctly the universality of the idea of God; and even after revelation has restricted itself to one race, the divine training aims continually at awakening the consciousness of this universality (Gen. 28: 15, 16).

It cannot be disputed *that many of the Israelites* regarded Jehovah only as a god beside other gods of the people, but it is equally clear, however, that this view is always combated by the organs of revelation as a perversion of the idea of Jehovah. Judaism is certainly right in continually proclaiming the passage Deut. 6: 4 as the most holy word, which includes the fundamental doctrine of monotheism. Of the two admissible explanations of this passage, *a)* "Hear, O Israel: the Lord our God is one Lord," and *b)* "the Lord our God, the Lord is one," the latter seems the more correct. This passage together with Deut. 4: 35 and 4: 39, affirms the unity of God in the strictest sense.

Another question has also been raised, whether the gods of the heathen did not exist according to the Old Testament, if not as gods, at least as *living beings*, perhaps as demons, or evil angels. It is highly probable that in 1 Cor. 8: 4, 5; 10: 19, 20, Paul, when he used the word *demons* in speaking of the Greek gods, takes it from the LXX of Deut. 32: 17. According to Paul the idols whom the Gentiles worshiped are the demons or the evil angels, the servants and organs of Satan; and it is through them, probably, that the Devil has especial dominion over heathendom.¹

[Analysis: 1) Monotheism a fundamental doctrine of Mosaism; 2) the idea of God was universal; 3) the unity of God was not gradually developed from a polytheistic religion; 4) the O. T. decidedly excludes the idea that other gods rule side by side with Jehovah; 5) the testimony of Deut. 4: 35, 39; 6: 4; 6) the gods of the heathens are the evil angels.]

§ 44. Formal Definition of the Idea of God as the Holy One.

God is *Kadosh*, the *Holy* One. In virtue of its inexhaustible signification, the divine holiness is one of

¹ **Schultz:** In such passages as Deut. 32: 17 and Ps. 106: 37, the heathen gods and demons seem to merge into one another. Azazel is also an instance of the same kind (vol. 2, p. 275 note).

the most difficult terms in the Bible to define. The first declaration of the divine holiness is found in Moses' song of praise, Ex. 15: 11 (glorious in holiness).

When holiness is predicated of the covenant people and covenant ordinances, two things are implied: 1) being taken out of worldliness; 2) being appropriated by God. Whenever this character of holiness pertains to anything, this never rests on a natural quality. The idea of natural purity and impurity does not coincide with that of holiness and unholiness. The holiness of the creature always goes back to an act of the divine will. It is always a state in which the creature is bound to God by the appointment of God himself.¹

Where *kadosh* (holiness) is a designation of a *divine attribute*, there evidently lies in it primarily a negative element, by which it designates a state of *apartness*, God raising Himself up above others.² God's holiness is God's self-preservation, by virtue of which He remains like Himself in all relations which either are in Him or on which He enters in any way, and neither gives up any part of His divinity nor accepts anything ungodly. Two things lie in the divine holiness, 1) that He stands in opposition to the world, and again, 2) that He removes this opposition by choosing in the world some whom He places in communion with Himself (Isa. 57: 15).

All demonstrations of the divine covenant of grace are the issues of the divine holiness.

[Analysis: 1) God is the Holy One; 2) two things are implied when the word holy is applied to man; 3) its meaning when applied to God; 4) two things lie in the divine holiness.]

1 Diestel: In the most exact sense of the word, nothing is holy in and for itself till the will of Jehovah declares it to be His property (cited by Oehler).

* See Ex. 15: 11; Isa. 40: 25; Ps. 99: 2-5; 1 Sam. 2: 2,

§ 45. Fuller Definition of the Idea.

If, in order to come at the concrete side of the matter, we proceed from the question, what is the meaning of *God's sanctifying a people to Himself?*—the answer is, that it relates to a restoration of a perfect life, both inwardly and outwardly. Now, if we argue from this to the meaning of the divine holiness, it may be defined concretely as an *absolute perfection of life*, but essentially in an *ethical* sense. It is true, however, that the notions of divine *holiness* and *glory* are related. We may say with Oetinger, holiness is hidden glory, and glory disclosed holiness.

On the whole, we may define the divine holiness as mainly *separation from the impurity and sinfulness of the creature*, or expressed positively, the clearness and purity of the divine nature, which excludes all communion with what is wicked. In this sense the symbolical designation of the divine holiness is, that God is *light* (Isa. 10: 17). The divine holiness, as a *revealed* attribute, is not an abstract power, but is the divine self-representation and self-testimony for the purpose of giving to the world a participation in the perfection of the divine life.

Analysis: 1) The meaning of God's sanctifying a people to Himself; 2) the meaning of divine holiness; 3) divine holiness and glory related; 4) definition of divine holiness; 5) its symbolical designation; 6) its significance as a revealed attribute.]

§ 46. Characteristics connected with Divine Holiness. 1. Impossibility of Picturing God, Omnipresence, Spirituality.

1) Inasmuch as the divine holiness is the separateness of the Divine Being from all finiteness of the creature, it includes the *impossibility of forming an image* of the Divine Being. From Deut. 4: 15–19 we learn that the prohibition of representing God by any

figure or form is absolute.¹ Neither can any argument contradictory to the utterances of the Old Testament as to the idea of God be drawn from *anthropomorphisms*,² for no religion can dispense with such anthropomorphic expressions when it enters into the sphere of representative thought, and everything depends on making it sure that the literal application of such expressions shall be corrected by the whole conception of the idea of God.³

2) It is self-evident that the Pentateuch regards God, to whom the heaven and the heavens of heaven, the earth and all that is upon it, belong (Deut. 10: 14), as *omnipresent*, even when such express delineations of omnipresence as in Ps. 139, are not found in the Pentateuch. Compare, however, such passages as Gen. 16: 13; 28: 15-17; 46: 4; etc. Beyond this, the Pentateuch has mainly to do with the *special* presence which God gives by living among His people, when He localizes His face, His name, His glory—the so-called *Shekhina* (see § 63).

3) The express declaration that God is *spirit* does not occur in the Old Testament, which is rather accustomed to say that God *has* the spirit, and causes it to go out from Him; by which, however, the Spirit is indicated as the element of God's life (Isa. 40: 13; Ps. 139: 7; Isa. 31: 3). The absolute personality of God is weightily expressed in the word "I am He" (Deut. 32: 39; Isa. 43: 10).

[Analysis: 1) It is impossible to form an image of God; 2) also directly forbidden; 3) why anthropomorphisms are used; 4) God is regarded as omnipresent; 5) His spirituality; 6) His personality.]

¹ See also Ex. 20: 4; Deut. 5: 8.

² Those expressions in the Scriptures in which parts of the human body, or more generally the senses, are transferred to God.

³ **Schultz:** In such expressions the activity of the living God is simply defined after the manner of human acts....The O. T. writers sought to produce, in no doubtful fashion, the conception of a living, personal, acting God. (Vol. 2, pp. 104, 105).

§ 47. 2. The Divine Righteousness, Faithfulness, and Truth.

With the Divine holiness in its *ethical* character are connected the attributes of *divine righteousness*, *divine faithfulness* and *truth*. These attributes are united in the main passage, Deut. 32: 4.

1) God is *righteous*. The Hebrew word for *righteous* (*tsaddiq*), expresses what is straight and right, in the sense that God in His government always does what is suitable; namely 1) what answers fully to His aim; and 2) what answers to the constitution of the object of the divine action. Specially, but not exclusively, the sphere in which this righteousness manifests itself is the judicial activity of God.¹

2) As in the idea of Jehovah, who is absolutely immutable, so also in the idea of the Holy One in virtue of its ethical meaning, the attribute of *truth* and *faithfulness* is given (compare Isa. 49: 7; Hos. 11: 9).² In

Schultz: The first attribute of moral perfection is righteousness, that moral exactitude with which God applies the standard (which He has within Himself) of perfect motives, without fear, partiality, or selfishness, wherever His revelation finds expression. *Tsaddiq* describes God as the mighty Rock on which the moral order of the universe is founded, in which the pious may safely trust for defence against the mighty wicked (Ps. 7: 9, 17). Faith in God's righteousness the godly man must retain, in spite of all the apparent success of injustice (Jer. 12: 1). It is the pledge that justice will triumph in the world (Isa. 42: 21; Ps. 119: 137).... Where the righteousness of God is celebrated, it is combined with His "goodness," because he who is faithful to the covenant may hope for salvation equally from both (Ps. 33: 5; 35: 28; 40: 10; 145: 7). There is never any antagonism between the goodness of God and His righteousness. But God as the righteous one is of course also the Judge of the world, before whom wickedness meets its doom (Deut. 32: 4; Ps. 9: 4, 7, 8; 96: 13); the God who sanctifies Himself by righteousness, and gives expression to His righteousness by punishment (Isa. 5: 16; 10: 22). (Vol. 2, pp. 152, 153).

² **Schultz:** Trustworthiness and truthfulness, together with righteousness, are the main elements of human honesty, and are the necessary foundation of confidence. Thus God is trustworthy, in the very highest sense. He shows Himself so when He swears by himself (Gen. 22: 16). His word which He pledged to the fathers He redeemed in every act of His providence.... He is true (2 Sam. 7:

the Old Testament this attribute is specially emphasized in referring to the the divine *word of promise*, and the agreement of the divine action therewith. One of the chief passages in the Pentateuch is Num. 23: 19. (Compare 1 Sam. 15: 29; Ps. 36: 5).

[Analysis: 1) God is righteous; 2) meaning of *tsaddiq*; 3) statement of Schultz; 4) God is the righteous judge; 5) God is trustworthy; 6) the faithfulness of God; 7) righteousness and faithfulness explain each other.]

§ 48. 3. The Jealous God.

In the idea of divine holiness is included that God is a *Jealous God* (Ex. 34: 14; Deut. 6: 15). The divine *zeal* is the *energy of the divine holiness*. The divine *zeal* has a twofold form:

1) It turns itself avengingly against every violation of the divine will. God's jealousy turns especially against idolatry (Deut. 32: 21), and generally against all sin by which God's holy name is desecrated. Thus the divine *jealousy* manifests itself as *divine wrath*. For the wrath of God is the most intense energy of the holy will of God, the zeal of His wounded love. On the connection of the two ideas, jealousy and wrath, compare Deut. 6: 15; 32: 21, 22; Ps. 78: 58, 59.

As wrath is a manifestation of divine holiness, the occasion of its outburst does not lie in a capricious divine humor or natural malignity, but wholly in the person smitten by it. If man denies and rejects the testimony of the holy God which was given to him, justice must be executed upon him in his resistance of

28); His words are pure (Ps. 12: 6); He hateth falsehood (Prov. 15: 26); what he says he really means. On this depend both the the law and the prophecies. References to God's fidelity and truth are uncommonly frequent all through the O. T. In many instances righteousness and faithfulness are synonymous, or, at any rate, they explain each other (Ps. 36: 5, 6; 96: 13; 143: 1). (Vol. 2, pp. 156, 157).

God's will, which alone is in the right, by his being reduced to his own nothingness. But the manifestation of wrath also receives its measure from divine holiness, which measure is ordained by the divine aim of salvation, and hence it is not the sway of blind passion (Hos. 11: 9; Jer. 10: 24; and the parable in Isa. 28: 23—29).

2) Jehovah is Jealous not for Himself alone, but also for *His holy people*, so far as they are in a position of grace, or are taken into favor again by Him. From this side His jealousy is the *zeal of love* as an energetic vindication of the unmatched relation in which God has placed His people to Himself. The *anthropopathies*¹ of the Old Testament come for the most part under this heading.

[Analysis: 1) Divine jealousy is the energy of the divine holiness; 2) this jealousy manifests itself as divine wrath; 3) definition of the wrath of God; 4) the occasion of its manifestation; 5) receives its measure from divine holiness; 6) His jealousy is the zeal of love; 7) the meaning of the anthropopathies of the O. T.; 8) do not express a change in the divine nature.]

¹ Those declarations concerning God in which human emotions, and changes in these emotions, are attributed to God. These expressions refer to a change of the *relation* in which the divine holiness, which is in itself changeless, enters into with changeable man. The Old Testament does not suppose that a change in the divine nature itself takes place. Compare 1 Sam. 15: 29 with v. 35. Such anthropopathies serve to keep wakeful and strong the consciousness of the living, holy God (*Oehler*).

CHAPTER VI.

THE MOSAIC DOCTRINE OF THE CREATION AND PRESERVATION OF THE WORLD.

§ 49. General Survey.

The existence of the world as absolutely due to the divine causality is presented in three propositions:

1) When reflection is directed to *the existence* of the world, both as to its beginning and as to its subsistence, we reach the doctrine of the *Creation* and *Preservation* of the world.

2) When we consider how the world is so, and not otherwise, we get the doctrine of the *aim* of the world and of divine *Providence*, with which is connected the question of the relation of the *divine causality* to the *wickedness* and *evil* in the world.

3) For the realization of His aim, God enters *on a peculiar relation to the world*; the means by which God brings about this His special relation to the world are exhibited in the doctrine of *Revelation*.

These three topics will be fully discussed in the next three chapters.

§ 50. Creation by the Word.

The Mosaic doctrine of creation rests on two fundamental thoughts: 1) that the production of the world proceeded from the *Word*; and 2) from the *Spirit of God*.¹

¹ **Schultz:** God is represented as connected with existence outside of Himself by the concept of "the Spirit and the Word of God."His Word creates the world,—that is, God's inner world of thought becomes through His will, the source of life outside of himself. (Vol. 2, p. 184).

The form of the creation of the world is the speaking, or the *Word* of God; this means that the world originated *through a conscious, free, divine act*. This excludes 1) every theory of the origin of the world by *emanation*; and 2) the assumption of an *eternal elementary matter* independent of God.

The first verse of Genesis is not to be considered as a title, a summary statement of the contents of the chapter, but rather a declaration of the primordial creation of the matter of the universe.

The central idea is *creation*, and the Hebrew word *bara* here used, always means the production of something new which has not had a previous existence.

It is clear that Mosaism places itself above all natural religions by the declaration, "In the beginning God created the heaven and the earth."

[Analysis: 1) The Mosaic doctrine of Creation rests on two facts; 2) the form of the creation; 3) this excludes certain theories of the origin of the world; 4) Gen. 1: 1 is not a superscription; 5) the meaning of *bara*; 6) the O. T. religion not a natural religion.]

§ 51. The Divine Spirit in Creation.

Since the world is placed outside of God, it originated and subsists only by the life imparted to it by His Spirit; thus it is not *separated* from Him, although *distinct* from Him.¹

1 **Schultz**: The teaching of the narrative in Genesis may be summed up as follows:

"1. God and the world are distinct. The sum of Being outside God is an object upon which God acts; it exists therefore apart from God.

2. God and the world are not independent....The laws of the world are an expression of the divine will. The earth brings forth at God's Word and command, obeying his will and fulfilling it by her order. Between the order of nature and the will of the living God there is no antagonism.

3. God and the world are not antagonistic. It places itself at God's command, so that He can make everything 'very good;' and He, on His part, rejoices over it and blesses the creatures on it" (Vol. 2, pp. 188, 189).

The life of the creature, according to the record of creation does not proceed from the chaotic mass; but life comes from God (Ps. 36: 9). That the Spirit of God really acts in the creative word, and that it is itself endued with the power of life, is indicated by the expression in Ps. 33: 6, where the Spirit is characterized as the Spirit of the divine mouth; it lies also in Isa. 40: 13, that the Divine Spirit acting in the creation is a consciously working and intelligent power, as, according to Ps. 139: 7, the divine omnipresence in the world acts by means of the all penetrating Spirit of God. Creature life proceeds from God, but it does not flow from God; it is imparted freely by God to the creature (Isa 42: 5). It is not a life which God lives in the creature, but a relatively independent life of the creature, derived from God.

[Analysis: 1) God and the world are distinct; 2) God and the world are not independent; 3) God and the world in the act of creation are not antagonistic; 4) life comes from God; 5) the Spirit acting in creation is a consciously working and intelligent power; 6) the life in the creature, though derived from God, is a relatively independent life.]

§ 52. On the Preservation of the World.

1) The preservation of the world is, on the one hand, distinguished in the Old Testament from its creation, inasmuch, as, according to Gen. 2: 2, the production of the classes of creatures has a conclusion, which is formed by the Sabbath of creation; while on the other hand, the agency of God in this preservation is represented as a *continuous creation*.¹

2) The continuance of this system of the world is established at each moment by the divine omnipotence. *The preservation of the world rests continually on*

¹ Schultz: In the growth of individual creatures, creation and preservation run into each other....The development and continued existence of the creature is dependent on the continuance of God's creative activity (Vol. 2, p. 189).

the same foundation as the creation, on God's *Word of command*, which He continually *sends forth* (Ps. 147: 15-18); and it rests just as continually on the Divine Spirit, which He causes ever to go forth (Ps. 104: 29, 30). This last passage shows how the preservation of the creature can be looked at from the point of view of a *continuous creation*; and this thought, that a creative working of God goes on in the preservation of creation, is in general imprinted in various forms on the Old Testament phraseology (Ex. 4: 11; Isa. 42: 5). The Psalm of creation (Ps. 104), by using participles in verse 2, characterizes the creative agency of God as an agency which continues to work in the preservation of the world.

[Analysis: 1) Preservation may be regarded as a continuous creation; 2) it rests on God's Word of command; 3) the Psalm of creation.]

CHAPTER VII.

THE MOSAIC DOCTRINE OF DIVINE PROVIDENCE.

§53. The Design of Creation, and its Realization through Providence.

That a divine *plan* is to be realized in the world, and that the divine creation is therefore a teleological act, is shown in the *account of the creation*. In all His creating God approves the works of His hands; but still the creating God does not reach the goal of His creation until He has set over against Him His image in man. From this last fact it is plain that the *self-revelation* of God, the unveiling of His Being, is the final end of the creation of the world; or to express it more generally, that the whole world serves to reveal the divine *glory*, and is thereby the object of divine joy (Ps. 104: 31).

But in mankind the aim of the creation of the world, the glorifying of God, was disturbed by *sin*. But in spite of the dominion of sin, the divine aim in the world shall come to its realization (Num. 14: 21). The choosing of the race through which God's blessing shall come on all races of the earth (Gen. 12: 3; 18: 18), serves this divine aim.

It is clear that the Old Testament teaches a providence which embraces everything, since it subjects everything to the divine direction (Ps. 65: 2). The divine providence extends also to the *animals* (Ps. 104: 21, 27; Job 38: 41; Ps. 147: 9). No sphere of *chance* exists in the Old Testament. From Ex. 21:

13, we infer that even what men call accidental death is under God's direction. Even in drawing lots "the lot is cast into the lap; but the whole disposing thereof is of the Lord" (Prov. 16: 33).

[Analysis: 1) The divine creation is a teleological act; 2) the final aim is the self-revelation of God; 3) and the manifestation of the divine glory; 4) this glorifying of God was disturbed by sin; 5) but the divine aim shall be realized; 6) the choosing of Israel serves this aim.]

§ 54. Relation of the Divine Causality to Moral and Physical Evil.

Moral and physical evil were not originally in the world. The latter was penally ordained (Gen. 3: 17–19) after the former had entered the world by the free act of man, and from this time forward both form an element of the order of the world.

1) *Physical evil* in the Old Testament is regarded as *punishment for sin*, or divine judgment. In the Pentateuch it is taught that the evil in man's life is also a means of proving him, especially of *proving his obedience* and his trust in God, and thus a means of purifying him. According to Deut. 8: 2, 3, the privations endured in the wilderness were meant to be a school of humility and faith, that the people might learn to trust to the power of the Almighty God.

2) But also, even in *moral evil*, in man's sin, the divine causality operates, and this it does in various ways.

Man's sin *cannot thwart the divine purpose* of salvation; it must rather serve to the realization thereof (Gen. 45: 8; 50: 20).

The wickedness of some must serve to prove and purify *others*, that it may be known whether they are strong to stand against it (Deut. 13: 3).

But a divine causality works also in regard to the

sinner himself, and for various ends. God *permits* one who habitually walks in God's ways to fall into sin in order to try him, to *reveal to him a hidden curse in his heart*, and so to bring to its issue a merited judgment, and thus bring God's justice to light. Compare 2 Sam. 24 (the numbering of the people); 2 Chron. 32: 31.

On another, who internally cherishes sin within him, and wilfully strives against God, the divine causality acts by *giving him up to sin*, so that sinning becomes necessary to this man, and he must glorify God by the judgment which he has incurred. This is the *hardening of the heart* of a man, so often spoken of in the Pentateuch, Ex. 4: 21; 7: 3 (Pharaoh); Deut. 2: 30 (Sihon); etc.

The expressions used to denote hardening of the heart cannot be referred to a simply negative relation to wickedness; but still man's sin is not removed because a positive divine agency rules in his hardening. Man can indeed do nothing that would not on the one side be God's work (Lam. 3: 37, 38), and yet he must acknowledge sin as his guilt (Lam. 3: 39). Isa. 45: 7 (a passage possibly directed against the dualism of the Persian religion) shows especially how the Monism of the Old Testament permitted nothing to be withdrawn from the divine causality.

[Analysis: 1) Physical evil is punishment for sin; 2) its aim is to purify man; 3) the divine causality operates even in moral evil; 4) sin is made subservient to the purpose of salvation; 5) hardening of the heart.]

CHAPTER VIII.

THE MOSAIC DOCTRINE OF REVELATION.

§ 55. Introductory Remarks and General View.

1) Although God has made Himself known in *genera revelation* (see § 6), He nevertheless makes Himself known in a more *special* sense, in which He is pleased to enter into the limits of the sphere of the creature, in order to present Himself personally, and to give testimony of Himself to man. This side of the *revelation of the Divine Being* is characterized as the divine *name*, the divine *presence* and the divine *glory*.

2) The forms and vehicles in which this divine self-presentation and self-witness reaches man *from without* are 1) the *voice*, 2) the *Malakh* or Angel, 3) the *Shekhina* in the sanctuary, and 4) *miracle*. The divine self-witness enters the *heart* of man by means of the Spirit.

[Analysis: 1) Distinction between general and special revelation; 2) four ways through which revelation reaches man *from without*; 3) the internal revelation.]

§ 56. The Revelation of the Divine Name.

The true God can be named by man only so far as He reveals Himself to man and discloses to him His nature. God names Himself according to the relation in which He has placed Himself to man, and according to the attributes by which He wishes to be acknowledged, known and addressed by man. In short, God names Himself, not according to what He is for Himself, but according to *what He is for man*; and there-

fore every self-presentation of God in the world is expressed by a corresponding name of God, as we have already seen (see § 36–39). In the *New Testament* stage, when the only begotten Son has revealed God's name to man (John 17: 6), it is God's good pleasure to be named the *Father of our Lord Jesus Christ*, or, to express universally the now completed relation of salvation, by the name of the *Father, Son, and Holy Ghost* (Matt. 28: 19).

The expression "name of God" is not merely a title, but at the same time the whole divine self-presentation by which God in personal presence testifies of Himself—the *whole side of the divine nature which is turned toward man*. It designates every *manifestation* of the Divine Being which attaches to places, institutions, and facts, in virtue of which God gives His people a direct experience of Himself. Wherever God is known and experienced in personal *presence*, there His name is.

Accordingly the name of God is certainly not the *ideal* existence of God in the consciousness of the created spirit, but an objective existence, independent of man's subjectivity.

[Analysis: 1) We can only name God in so far as he reveals Himself; 2) God names Himself in what He is for man; 3) His most glorious name given in the N. T.; 4) signification of "name of God;" 5) where His personal presence is manifested there is His name.]

§ 57. The Divine Countenance and the Divine Glory.

That by which God is present among His people is further styled the *divine countenance* (presence). Ex. 33: 14–16 is the main passage.

By the face of God is meant, in distinction from His transcendent and infinite nature, His *coming down into the sphere of the created, whereby He can be brought with-*

in the immediate knowledge of man. Here belongs Deut. 4: 37, where it is said that Jehovah brought Israel out of Egypt by His countenance (with His presence). Only from this, too, is the full meaning of the high priest's blessing rightly understood, Num. 6: 24—26.

Finally, for name and countenance the indefinite expression, *glory of Jehovah* is used (Ex. 33: 18).¹ In the same way, it is *the glory of Jehovah* through which Jehovah appears to His people on Mount Sinai, under cover of the cloud (Ex. 24: 16), and which is present in the holy tabernacle (Ex. 40: 34).

[Analysis: 1) Meaning of the divine countenance; 2) of Num. 6: 24—26; 3) meaning of "the glory of Jehovah."]

§ 58. The Divine Voice as a Form of Revelation.

As divine speech is in general the form of divine working in the world, so the *Word* is the most general form of divine revelation. So far as this Word of God comes internally to the organs of revelation, it coincides with the revelation which is effected by the Spirit (compare § 65). But the Old Testament specifies also among its mediums of revelation the outwardly audible *voice*; indeed, in Deut. 4: 12, special weight is laid upon this form of revelation.

With this was connected in the latter Jewish theology the doctrine of the *Bath-Kol*, or revelations by means of heavenly voices, such as Elijah received. The expression *Bath-Kol* (daughter of the voice) means that the divine voice itself is not heard, but only its working, or else that *Kol* designates the heavenly

¹ **Schultz:** What the religion of Israel denotes by this word is certainly, in the first instance, the actual presence of the God of light—God's revealed glory as it appears to his favored ones in all its grandeur and majesty (Ex. 33: 22; 24: 16)....Generally the phrase denotes the special majesty of God's revealed Being, the perfect fulness of his Godhead, which the creature has to acknowledge, praise and glorify (Vol. 2, pp. 172, 173).

voice itself, and *Bath-Kol* its echo. This form of revelation appears in the *New Testament* in Matt. 3: 17; 17: 5; John 12: 28; and very frequently in the Apocalypse.

[Analysis: 1) Revelation is generally by means of the Word; 2) mention is made of the audible voice; 3) the doctrine of the Bath-Kol; 4) this form of revelation appears in the New Testament.]

§ 59. The Doctrine of the Angel of the Lord, of the Covenant, of the Countenance.¹ The Exegetical State of the Case.

In a more concrete form God manifests Himself in the *Malakh* (angel), generally called *Malakh Jehovah*.

The principal passages are:

1) Gen. 16: 7–14, where the *Malakh* appears to Hagar.

2) Gen. 18: 1–33, where one of the three men (angels) is expressly distinguished as Jehovah (vv. 20, 26, etc.) from the two others who are called angels (Gen. 19: 1), and are said (Gen. 19: 13) to be sent by Jehovah.

3) Gen. 22: 11, 12, where the *Malakh Jehovah* calls to Abraham from heaven as if he were God Himself.

4) Gen. 31: 11–13, where the *Malakh Jehovah* calls himself “the God of Bethel.”

5) Gen. 32: 29–31, where the man (angel) with which Jacob wrestles is designated as an appearance of God.

6) Gen. 48: 15, 16, where God is identified with the *Malakh*.

7) Ex. 3: 2, and the following narrative, where the *Malakh Jehovah* is identified with Jehovah and Elohim.

¹ The doctrine of the Angel of the Lord is one of the most important and difficult points in the Old Testament, on which, even as early as the Church Fathers, there were various views, and about which, to this day, no agreement has been reached. The literature is enormously rich.

8) in Ex. 13: 21 it is said that *Jehovah* went before Israel; on the other hand in Ex. 14: 19 we read that it was the *Malakh*. ✓

9) Josh. 5: 14, 15; 6: 2, where the prince of the army of Jehovah appears to Joshua. ✕

§ 60. The Different Interpretations.

The following main views are to be distinguished :

1) The view taken in the early ages of the church by Augustine, Jerome, and Gregory the Great; in our day with special modifications by Hofmann, from whom it has been adopted by Kurtz and Delitzsch (though Delitzsch holds the view with peculiar indecision)—that an *angel* is to be understood by the *Malakh*, a *finite* spirit under subjection to God, which executes the divine command in the cases mentioned.

But this first view occurs in *two forms*. *a*) Some hold that the *Malakh* is an angel specially deputed by God from among the number of *Malakhim* for *each separate occasion*, and that we have no means of deciding whether he is always the same angel or not; *b*) others maintain (principally Hofmann) that it is *one and the same angel* through whom God stands in relation to the people of revelation from the beginning to the end of the Old Testament—the *special angel* who rules in the commonwealth and history of this people, the archangel Michael of the book of Daniel.

2) The second principal view is that the *Malakh* of Jehovah is a *self-representation of Jehovah entering into the sphere of the creature*, and is *one in essence with Jehovah*.¹

¹ **Schultz:** In all the passages where it is stated that the angel of God appeared and spoke, it is also assumed, without further explanation, that the personal covenant God Himself appeared and spoke ... When God wishes to communicate His will for the purpose of making men conscious of it, He requires the revealing form

There are different forms of this view, but the most important is the one which regards the *Malakh* as the *Logos*, the *second* person of the Godhead in the sense of the Christian doctrine of the Trinity. This is the view of the most of the Greek Fathers, of Justin, Irenaeus, Tertullian, Cyprian, and Eusebius. At a later period this was the view of the Lutheran theologians; and in our own day has been defended by Hengstenberg and others.

Oehler maintains that the doctrine of the *Malakh* in the Old Testament oscillates in a peculiar manner between its conception of the angel, as a form and as a being, so that it seems impossible to bring the matter to a definite intelligible expression. He states, however, that the case has a different aspect from the standpoint of the New Testament. From this (see especially 1 Cor. 10: 4) it is *the Logos, the Son of God* through whom revelations to Israel are made, and who therefore works in the *Malakh*. But nowhere in the New Testament is the Son of God so identified with the *Malakh* as if His incarnation had been preceded by His *permanently* becoming an angel. The *Logos*, according to the New Testament view, works also in the other forms of revelation in the Old Covenant and in just the same way as in the form of the *Malakh*.

In the later Jewish theology, the doctrine of the *Metathron* (sharer of the throne),—the Prince of the to be a person who thinks and speaks. He reveals Himself through “angels.”...But the Angel of God is he in whom God makes known to man, for special ends, His whole being and will. The form of manifestation here also is a personal being, who is not God. But what this being is, is of absolutely no consequence ...There is however, undoubtedly in the angel of God something of that which Christian theology means to express by the doctrine of the *Logos*. Only the self-revealing life of God is not yet human, nor does it yet exist as a permanent personal life (Vol. 2, pp. 220—223).

countenance, who is the revealer of God, the mediator between God and the creature,—is developed out of the Old Testament doctrine of the Angel of the Lord.

[Analysis: 1) Some understand by the Malakh a finite, created angel; 2) two forms of this view; 3) others regard the Malakh a self-representation of Jehovah; 4) the view held by Schultz; 5) the Malakh may be regarded as a manifestation of the second person of the Trinity; 6) Oehler's view; 7) the New Testament interpretation.]

§ 61. Other Points of the Mosaic Angelology.

Even in the Pentateuch, though there comparatively seldom, other angels of God appear side by side with the Malakh. Nothing is said about their creation; nor are they mentioned in the account of the creation of the earth, and its completion in man, although it is implied in Gen. 2: 1. On the contrary Job 38: 7 presupposes the existence of the angels when the earth was created. Gen. 6: 1–4 would be entirely without a parallel, not only in the Pentateuch, but in the whole Old Testament, if higher spirits are to be understood by the *Sons of God*. The question is: Are the Sons of God, Sethites, or, are they higher spirits? and is a fall of the angels here spoken of? At present the hypothesis of the fall of the angels is the most widely spread (so Hofmann, Kurtz, Delitzsch), a view which originally sprang from the book of Enoch. But Oehler (with the Reformers, and in more modern times Hengstenberg, Keil, and others), rightly refers the expression “sons of God” to *men*, to the *pious race descended from Seth*, as the name “Sons of God” is used in Deut. 14: 1; 32: 5; Hos. 1: 10; Ps. 73: 15.¹

In comparison with the later books of the Old Tes-

¹ On this view the passage refers to the marriage of Seth's descendants with Cainitic women, by which means the corruption of Cain's race spread among the Sethites.

tament, the angelology of the Pentateuch is but little developed.

[Analysis: 1) The creation of angels implied in Gen. 2: 1; 2) created before the earth; 3) meaning of Gen. 6: 1—4; 4) angelology but little developed in the Pentateuch.]

§ 62. The Shekhina.

The continuous localization of the divine presence was made in the *Shekhina*, (*shakhan*, he dwelt, resided), that is, the dwelling of God, distinguished from passing theophanies by virtue of its countenance. The first abode of the divine Shekhina, according to the Old Testament, was Eden, as appears from the whole description in Gen. 2 and 3, but in particular from the mention of the cherubim (Gen. 3: 24), which were bearers of the divine presence. The book of Genesis seems to suggest the idea that the dwelling place of the glory and the countenance of God continued there upon the earth until the judgment of the flood came on the world. Then after the flood God revealed Himself for the first time from heaven. At a later time, God's dwelling among His people was in the sanctuary (Ex. 40: 34—38). Here now is God's *countenance* (Ex. 23: 17; Deut. 31: 11; Ps. 42: 2; 63: 3). From passages such as Lev. 9: 24; 10: 2, the Shekhina shows its reality in the sanctuary by means of acts of power which go out from it. The Shekhina of God on earth corresponds to His dwelling in *heaven* (1 Kings 8: 30, 39, 49), which, like that in the sanctuary, is definitely distinguished from the presence of God, which embraces the whole universe (1 Kings 8: 27).

According to this presentation, God's dwelling is outside the human subject. The idea of the divine habitation is not applied to the sending of the divine

spirit into the heart of man. The New Testament (John 1: 14) is the first to place the divine Shekhina in a human person, in the Logos become flesh, and then it speaks of God's making His abode with believers (John 14: 23). Still the proper Shekhina of God in heaven appears again in the Apocalypse (Rev. 7: 15), and the aim of the Divine Kingdom is said to be the *dwelling* of God on the glorified earth (Rev. 21: 3). See also Jer. 3: 16-18.

[Analysis: 1) Meaning of Shekhina; 2) God's first dwelling-place was Eden; 3) later on in the sanctuary; 4) the teaching of the New Testament; 5) of Revelation.]

§ 63. The Doctrine of Miracle. Its Appearance in History and Various Names.

By *miracles*, the Old Testament understands manifestations of the divine *power* in the objective world, both in nature and history.¹ It is characteristic of the course of Old Testament revelation, that no real miracle—wrought by man's agency—is related in the *time of the patriarchs*. *Moses* is the first organ of revelation endowed with the gift of performing miracles. They occur chiefly when the point in question is to give testimony for the reality of the God revealed in Israel, in opposition to heathenism.

The closer definition of the notion of miracles follows mainly from the *names for a miracle*:

1) The most general expression *pe-le, niphlaoth*, characterizes a miracle in its *negative* aspect, as an occurrence withdrawn from the common course of things, and thus an *extraordinary occurrence*. In the New Testament this negative characteristic of a

¹ **Schultz**: The whole O. T. regards the miraculous as a matter of course....The essence of a miracle is not that it is "unnatural," but that it is a specially clear and striking proof of God's power, and of the freedom he exercises in furthering his objects (Vol. 2, pp. 192, 193).

miracle is denoted by the expression *teras* (*terata*, only in the plural).

2) The *positive* side of a miracle is expressed in the term *gebhuroth* (mighty deeds), corresponding to the New Testament *dynameis*, indications of divine *power*. Side by side with which there appears the more general emphatic expression *ma-asim*, or more frequently, *'aliloth*, the great deeds, corresponding to *erga* in John. According to this, a miracle would mainly be a *divine act of power, exempt from the common course of nature and history*.

3) But the full idea is expressed only by its *teleological* designation as *'oth* (sign),¹ the *semeion* of the New Testament, according to which its meaning is, an *indication of something higher and divine, and so to serve a definite divine aim*.

[Analysis: 1) Definition of miracle; 2) time of occurrence; 3) explanation of names for miracles.]

§ 64. More exact Definition of Miracles.

The more exact definition of miracles in the more limited sense is given by the more exact definition of the *aim* of miracles, namely, that miracles serve to reveal God in His Kingdom. *Miracles*, in the stricter sense, are *extraordinary manifestations and occurrences, in which God makes known His power for the purposes of His Kingdom in a unique manner*.

§ 65. Of the Spirit of God.

God reveals Himself in the heart of man by His *Spirit (ruach)*. As the *principle of cosmical life*, as *ruach Elohim*, as the mighty divine force of all things, the

¹ **Schultz:** The chief use of the miracle is to convince, to act as a sign (*'oth*) that the living God is in the midst of His people, as a pledge by which God, as the absolutely supernatural, attests the commission of His messengers, and confirms their words (vol. 2, pp. 195, 196).

Spirit is the principle of the life of man's soul, and every natural intellectual gift in man is traced back to it. (Joseph's wisdom, Gen. 41: 38; Bezaleel's skill in art, Ex. 31: 3; 35: 31.) From Gen. 6: 3 we learn that the Spirit of God has also an ethical significance; for, according to this passage, the government of God's Spirit is hampered by the errors of mankind.

The Spirit as *ruach Jehovah* only acts within the *sphere of revelation*. In the Old Testament, the Spirit's work in the divine kingdom is rather that of *endowing the organs of the theocracy with the gifts required for their calling*, and these gifts of office in the Old Testament are similar to the gifts of grace in the New Testament (1 Cor. 12). In the *Pentateuch* its working appears exclusively in this connection. The Spirit bestows on Moses and the 70 elders skill to guide the people (Num. 11: 17), also on Joshua (Num. 27: 18; Deut. 34: 9). As the Spirit of revelation, He produces in particular the gift of prophecy (Num. 11: 25); and even as *ruach Elohim* imparts ability to prophesy to the heathen Balaam (Num. 24: 2), by which means he is made an organ of the revealing God against his will (Num. 22: 38).

The Spirit, however, does not appear in the Pentateuch as *the principle of Sanctification in the pious*; this is first spoken of in the Psalms (Ps. 51: 10-12; 143: 10).¹

Now this Spirit is represented as a *power proceeding from Jehovah, a something communicated by Him*, which clings to the person to whom it is communicated¹ (Num. 11: 17, 25).

The relation of the Spirit of revelation to the human spirit

¹ Though we must not read the New Testament doctrine of the Trinity into the Old Testament, it is yet undeniable that we find the way to the doctrine of the Trinity already prepared in the doctrine of the Malakh and of the Spirit.

is characterized in a way that makes it clear why a full *indwelling* of the Spirit in man, a penetration of the human spirit by the Holy Spirit, is not reached in the Old Testament, but only a working on the human mind.

[Analysis: 1) The Spirit is the principle of the life of man's soul; 2) distinction between *ruach* Elohim and *ruach* Jehovah; 3) the doctrine of the Spirit in the Pentateuch; 4) the Psalms speak of the Spirit as the principle of sanctification; 5) distinction between the divine Spirit and the human spirit.]

§ 66. The Psychological States of the Organs of Revelation.

As *psychical states* in which the reception of revelation by man takes place, the principal passage (Num. 12: 6–8) names 1) *the dream*; 2) *the vision*; 3) *the immediate sight of the Divinity* as given to Moses, which stands higher than the other two.

1) *Dreams* appear in the Old Testament, as in antiquity generally, as the vehicle of divine elevation, but only in a subordinate way, and as the lowest form of revelation (1 Sam. 28: 6; Jer. 23: 28).

2) *Visions* presuppose a previous revelation of the life of the soul into an extraordinary state, as is made prominent in the first narrative in which a vision appears (in Gen. 15, with Abraham). Still the difference between a dream and a vision may be regarded as not sharply marked. By these two forms God speaks, as is said in Num. 12: 8, only in riddles, that is, in a way which requires an explanation of the pictures presented to view.

3) The *immediate view of the Divinity* (mouth to mouth, Num. 12: 8) with which Moses was favored stands higher than these forms;¹ that figureless, perfect, clear communication of knowledge, which is to

¹ In 1 Cor. 13: 12, that vision of the divinity which Moses had is designated by Paul as the form of knowledge with which we are not yet favored, but shall be in the future.

be distinguished also from the vision of God in emblematical tokens, spoken in Ex. 24: 10 of Aaron and the elders of Israel. The principle that a clear consciousness when receiving revelation is placed higher than ecstasy is of great importance for the right view of the Old Testament religion (Num. 12: 6-8; 1 Cor. 13: 12). The idea that in the case of some persons a view into the future opens at the moment of death is expressed in the Old Testament in Gen. 49, and Deut. 33, (in the blessings of Jacob and Moses).

[Analysis: 1) The dream the lowest form of revelation; 2) the vision; 3) the immediate view of the divinity; 4) the ecstatic state: 5) glimpses into the future at the hour of death.]

CHAPTER IX.

THE MOSAIC DOCTRINE OF THE NATURE OF MAN IN ITS MAIN UNCHANGEABLE FEATURES.

§ 67. General View.

First of all *the nature of man* is to be described without reference to the contradictory elements which through sin entered into its development; and then these contradictory elements are to be set forth as they appear in the difference between the *original perfection* of man on the one side, and the state of *sin and death* in which he now is on the other side. We have here to do only with the anthropology of Mosaism.¹

[Analysis: 1) The topic of anthropology is to be discussed under three general heads: 2) the best work is that of Delitzsch; 3) Beck is also valuable.]

§ 68. The Idea of Man.

The *idea of man* is expressed in the statement, that he is created in the *image of God* (Gen. 1: 26, 27; 9: 6). This divine image is propagated (Gen. 5: 1, 3). The statement in Gen. 1: 26 ("in our image, after our likeness") does not mean that the divine image is *two-fold*, but it rather expresses the thought that the divine image which man bears is really one corresponding to the original pattern.²

¹ For the rich literature on Biblical Anthropology see the most complete work on this topic: Delitzsch, *System of Biblical Psychology*. Edinburgh, 1869. Valuable also is the small work by Beck, translated into English under the title: *Outlines of Biblical Psychology*. Edinburgh, 1877.

² The patristic and the later ecclesiastical exposition attempted to draw an essential distinction between the ideas *image* and *likeness*, making the former denote the inalienable essence, the lat-

But now *what is to be understood* by the divine image? 1) We are certainly not to think of the human *body* as if it were a copy of the divine form, for Elohim, the creative God, is without form. We might rather say, that the human figure was to be so formed that it might serve to represent God Himself when He revealed Himself. 2) It is equally erroneous to limit the divine likeness to the *dominion over the animal world*, as the Socinians did. 3) The divine likeness is rather to be referred to the *whole dignity of man* (Ps. 8: 5, 6), in virtue of which human nature is sharply distinguished from that of the beasts; *man as a free being is set over nature, and designed to hold communion with God, and to be His representative on earth*. This image, therefore, lies in the spirit of man.

The spiritual dominion of man over the beasts is indicated in the giving of names (Gen. 2: 19, 20).

[Analysis: 1) Man is created in the image of God; 2) this image is propagated; 3) meaning of Gen. 1: 26; 4) this image is not that of the body; 5) nor does it consist in dominion over the animal world; 6) this image lies in his spirit.]

§ 69. Man in relation to Sex and Race.

1) *The sexual relation of man and woman is originally ordained* in Gen. 1: 27 ("male and female created He them"). This does not mean that man was originally created androgynous (a man who was at once a man and woman), but that man was created first, and the woman afterwards (Gen. 2: 22); as also the passage is understood in 1 Tim. 2: 13; 1 Cor. 11: 8, 9.

2) According to Gen. 2: 18, 24, *marriage*, that primitive form of human society from which all other forms of society arise, and for which man gives up

ter the likeness to God defaced by the Fall. But the two expressions *tselem* and *demuth* are substantially synonymous in Hebrew, and if there is any difference it is simply, as Schultz observes, the difference between the *concrete* and the *abstract*.

the others, did not spring from the blind sway of natural impulse, but from *divine institution*.

Its original form is monogamy (compare Matt. 19: 4-6). As indicative of character, polygamy is traced to the Cainites (Gen. 4: 19). The law does indeed tolerate polygamy, but does not sanction it, and moreover, provides against the wrongs that easily spring from it (Ex. 21: 10; Deut. 21: 15-17). Bigamy, in the form in which Genesis represents it as forced on Jacob, was afterwards expressly forbidden in the law (Lev. 18: 18). In general, monogamy remained predominant among the people of Israel; in fact the description of a wife in Prov. 12: 4; 19: 14; 31: 10-31, and in particular the prophetic representation of the covenant between Jehovah and His people as marriage, clearly presuppose that monogamy is the rule.

The possession of children, by which the house is built up is looked upon as a divine blessing (Gen. 1: 28). Childlessness is looked upon as the greatest misfortune to a house (Gen. 30: 23). To hinder fruitfulness is treated as an abomination worthy of death (Gen. 38: 9, 10).

3) *All mankind is a connected race of brothers* (Act. 17: 26). The differences between nations and orders of men do not rest on a diversity of physical origin, but upon the law of God, who made the nations to differ and set them their boundaries (Deut. 32: 8), and who reveals His retributive ordinances even in their natural character (Canaan, Moab, Ammon, etc.).

[Analysis: 1) The sexual relation was ordained by God; 2) marriage is a divine institution; 3) its original form was monogamy; 4) children are regarded a divine blessing; 5) the unity of the race.]

§ 70. Body, Soul, and Spirit as the Constituent Parts of Man.

Man, like all beings endowed with life originated from *two elements*, 1) from earthly material (*ground, dust*), and 2) from the Divine Spirit (*ruach*), Gen. 2: 7, compared with Ps. 104: 29, 30; 146: 4. As in general the soul (*nephesh*) originates in the flesh (*basar*) by the union of spirit with matter, so in particular the human soul arises in the human body by the breathing of the divine breath into the material frame of the human body. The soul, which is common to man and beast, *does not originate in the same way*. The souls of animals arise like plants from the earth, as a consequence of the divine word of power, Gen. 1: 24 ("let the earth bring forth the living *nephesh*"). Thus the creating spirit which entered in the beginning (Gen. 1: 2) into matter, rules in them. But the *human soul* does not spring from the earth; it is created by a *special act of divine inbreathing* (Gen. 2: 7 compared with Gen. 1: 26). Thus the *substance of the human soul is the divine spirit of life uniting with itself matter; the soul exists and lives only by the power of the spirit* (*ruach*). In the soul, which sprang from the spirit, and exists continually through it, lies the *individuality* of man, his *personality*, his *self*, his *ego*; because man *is* not spirit (*ruach*), but *has* it—he is *soul*. Man perceives and thinks by virtue of the *spirit* which animates him (Job 32: 8; Prov. 20: 27), but the perceiving and thinking subject itself is the soul (*nephesh*). The impulse to act proceeds from the spirit (*ruach*) (Ex. 35: 21), but the acting subject is the soul (*nephesh*); the *soul* is the subject which sins (Ezek. 18: 4). Love and attachment are of course a thing of the *soul* (Gen. 34: 3, 8). In many cases, however, *soul* and *spirit* stand indiffer-

ently, according as the personality is named after its special individual life, or after the living power which forms the condition of its special character.

From all this it is clear that the Old Testament does not teach a *trichotomy* of the human being in the sense of *body, soul, and spirit*, as being originally three co-ordinate elements of man; rather are we to regard the *body* and *spirit* of man as being of distinct natures, but the soul is of one nature with the spirit. The spirit is the inward being of the soul, and the soul is the external nature of the spirit.

In all ages a few passages in the Old Testament have been supposed by some to teach a pre-existence of the soul. But no such inference can be drawn from the main passages adduced for such a doctrine (Ps. 139: 15; Job 1: 21).

[Analysis: 1) Man has had his origin from two elements; 2) the soul had its origin in the union of spirit with matter; 3) the soul of man does not originate in the same way as the soul of the beast; 4) the human soul is created by a special act of inbreathing; 5) the essence of the human soul; 6) in the soul lies personality; 7) difference between the soul and the spirit; 8) the doctrine of trichotomy; 9) the O. T. does not teach the pre-existence of the soul.]

§ 71. The Heart and its Relation to the Soul.

The soul of man has a double sphere of life:

1) It is *anima*, that on which rests the life belonging to the senses, the soul of the flesh in the more limited sense. As such it acts in the *blood*, and supplies life to the body through the blood; hence the proposition, "The life (soul) of the flesh is in the blood" (Lev. 17: 11); indeed, it is said directly, "The blood is life (soul)," Gen. 9: 4; Lev. 17: 14; Deut. 12: 23.

2) It is not simply *anima*, the principal of life belonging to the senses, but it is at the same time *animus*

—*the subject of all the acts of knowing, feeling, and willing*, and especially the subject of those acts and states of man that refer to his communion with God (Deut. 4: 29; 6: 5; Isa: 61: 10; Ps. 19: 7; etc).

In both its relations, as *anima* and *animus*, *the soul centres in the heart*. The heart, as the central organ of the circulation of the blood ("the pitcher at the fountain," Eccles. 12: 6), forms the focus of the life of the body. But the heart is also the centre of all *spiritual* functions ("keep thy heart with all diligence; for out of it are the issues of life," Prov. 4: 23). In particular, the heart is the place in which the process of *self-consciousness* goes on, in which the soul is at home with itself and is conscious of all its doing and suffering as its own (Deut. 8: 5; Isa. 44: 18; etc). The heart is also the organ of the act of *knowing in general*, so that *heart* has often exactly the meaning of intellect, insight (Job 34: 10; Jer. 5: 21).

Now, because the heart is the central point of the person's life, the work-place for the personal appropriation and assimilation of everything spiritual, the *moral and religious* condition of man lies in the heart. Because of this, man is characterized by his *heart* in all his habitual and moral attributes. We read in Prov. 10: 8, of a wise heart; in Ps. 51: 12, of a pure (clean) heart; etc. So, on the other hand, of a perverse (froward) heart (Ps. 101: 4); of a stubborn and evil heart (Jer. 3: 17); etc. Accordingly the human heart is characterized in Jer. 17: 9 as "deceitful above all things" (properly rugged), and "desperately sick," so that God alone (but He completely, Prov. 15: 11) is able to fathom the depths of its perverseness; and hence the prayer in Ps. 139: 23, 24. Hence all *revelation* addresses itself to the *heart*, even the revelation of the law, Deut. 6: 6; for it demands love to God

from the whole *heart*, and starting from this centre, also from the whole soul (Deut. 11: 18). The work of revelation is directed to renewing man from the heart; its aim is to circumcise the heart (Deut. 30: 6),—to establish God's will within the heart (Jer. 31: 33).

Also on man's side the process of salvation begins in the heart. *Faith*, in which man's personal life in its deepest basis takes a new direction, belongs entirely to the sphere of the heart, and is described as a making fast, a making strong (Ps. 27: 14; 31: 24), a staying of the heart (compare especially Ps. 112: 7, 8) on that foundation which is God, "the Rock of my heart" (Ps. 73: 26): (Compare the same view in the New Testament—for example, Rom. 10: 9, 10).

[Analysis: 1) The soul of man is *anima*; 2) and at the same time *animus*; 3) in both these relations the soul centres in the heart; 4) it is the centre of all spiritual functions; 5) the centre of self-consciousness; 6) the organ of knowing in general; 7) the religious condition of man lies in the heart; 8) man's moral attributes are characterized by his heart; 9) revelation is addressed to the heart; 10) faith belongs to the sphere of the heart.]

CHAPTER X.

THE MOSAIC DOCTRINE OF MAN WITH REFERENCE TO SIN.

§ 72. The Primitive State of Man.

The condition of man in his primitive state was one of *innocence and childlike intercourse with God, of harmonious relation to nature, and, conditionally, of exemption from death.*

1) Man was created *good* (Gen. 1: 31), that is, conformed to the divine aim. But this good must be developed into *free self-determination*. The conception of the original state as a *created* condition of *wisdom* and *sanctity* contradicts the statement in Genesis; it would be much more in the sense of the Old Testament to say, as Eccl. 7: 29 expresses it: "God made man upright" (*right*). The view that the original state was only *an absence of actual sin*, in the sense either of a state of pure indifference, or a state in which the evil was already latent, so that in the Fall the disposition which already existed in man only came forth, is equally irreconcilable with Genesis.

2) In the primitive condition, man lives in undisturbed and peaceful union with nature and with God. The latter is made especially clear by the contrast implied in Gen. 3: 8. The peaceful relation of man with *nature* is taught partly in the description of life in Paradise in general, and partly in the contrast between the present relation of man to nature and his condition before sin, since man must now

make nature of service to him by toiling and struggling (Gen. 3: 17, 18; 5: 29), and since he exercises his dominion over the animals by deeds of violence and destruction of life (Gen. 9: 2, 3 contrasted with Gen. 1: 29). Hence *prophecy* has depicted the termination of this hostile relation in its description of the time of salvation (Isa. 11: 6-8; 65: 25).

3) Lastly, in Gen. 2, immortality is ascribed to man, but conditionally, in the sense of *to be able not to die* (*posse non mori*). This idea, indeed, does not necessarily lie in the words of Gen. 2: 17, but it is quite clear from Gen. 3: 22, that the possibility of reaching immortality was annexed to the life in Paradise, and that immortality was destined for man so far as he should live in unbroken communion with God. Nor on the other hand can we infer from Gen. 3: 19, that by nature man *must* die; the words only give the reason why the end of man's life, when once decreed, is brought about in the manner described as a dissolution of the body.

[Analysis: 1) The primitive state of man; 2) the state of innocence must be developed into free self-determination; 3) the original state was not a *created* condition of wisdom and sanctity; 4) nor was it only an absence of actual sin; 5) man lived in peaceful relation with nature; 6) the teaching of prophecy; 7) man was able not to die.]

§ 73. The Formal Principle of Sin.

1) Man can pass from the state of innocence into the possession of moral character only by *an act of self-determination*. When the woman (Gen. 3: 2, 3) remembers the divine command, and knows that she is bound by it, and thus acknowledges its obligatory force, she has not yet sinned, and yet she shows that she has a conscience. Hence it follows that, according to the Old Testament sin is not a necessary fac-

tor in the development of man, but a product of free choice.

2) The *first incitement* to transgress the command of God came from without. The account of the Fall presupposes *an ungodly principle which had already entered the world*, but does not give any further account of it.¹ But the chief thing at issue is this, that the seduction does not at all act by compulsion on man, but is successful only when man voluntarily ceases to resist temptation.

[Analysis: 1) Man sins by an act of self-determination; 2) Eve shows that she has a conscience; 3) sin is a product of free choice; 4) an ungodly principle in the world before man sinned; 5) man is not compelled to sin.]

§ 74. The Material Principle of Sin. The Old Testament Names of Sin.

The real principle of sin, is, according to the Old Testament, 1) unbelief of the divine word, 2) the selfish elevation of self-will above the divine will, and 3) the presumptuous trampling upon the limits set by divine command.

Gen. 3 disproves the doctrine, that, according to the Old Testament, the real principle of evil lies in matter, in the body. It is a *fundamental doctrine of the Old Testament* that evil is originally the denial of the divine will; that sin is sin because man selfishly exalts himself above God and His will.

Most probably such passages as Hos. 6: 7; Job 31: 33, refer to the Fall, and are correctly translated in the *text* of the Revised Version. The passage in Isa. 43: 27, "The first father sinned" refers evidently

¹ The New Testament teaches that the seduction of the first man is the work of Satan, especially in Rev. 12: 9, where the devil is called the **dragon**, the **old serpent**; compare also the allusion in Rom. 16: 20 to Gen. 3: 15.

to Abraham, for Adam is not the ancestor of Israel, but of humanity.

The following are the most common *Old Testament designations for Sin*:

1) *Chata* (first in Gen. 4: 7), *a missing, a deviation* from the divine way and goal prescribed for man by the divine will. It comprehends sins of weakness as well as sins of wickedness.

2) *'Avon, crookedness, perversion*, primarily referring to the character of an action. It is *the perversion of the divine law (anomia)*; then especially the *guilt of sin*, first in Gen. 15: 16 (iniquity). See Ps. 32: 5.

3) *Pesha*, sin in its intensification, *apostasy, rebellion against God. Design and set purpose* to sin are always implied in this word. Chief passage Job 34: 37.

4) *Resha*, the evil which has become an *habitual feature of the disposition and actions*. The underlying idea in *resha* appears to be *stormy excitement* (Job 3: 17).

5) *Aven*, evil as in itself *empty* and *worthless*.

[Analysis: The three elements of sin; 2) the real principle of evil does not lie in matter; 3) evil is originally the denial of the divine will; 4) the O. T. names for sin.]

§ 75. Sin as an Inclination. Transmission of Sin.

In consequence of the Fall, sin appears as a *state* in mankind, that is, an *inclination* which rules man, and as a common sinful life which is transmitted partly in mankind in general, and partly in an especial degree in particular races.

1) The *second* sin, that of self-excuse and palliation of the offence, follows immediately on the first, the sin of disobedience (Gen. 3: 10). As sin thus joins to sin, it becomes a *habitus*, and in this way a definite feature of the heart (*imagination of the heart*, Gen. 8: 21), an *inclination*, which gives a perverted tendency

to man's will (Gen. 6: 5). Because this sinful inclination (this is the meaning of the variously explained passage Gen. 8: 21) cleaves to man from his youth, the human race would lie under a continual sentence of destruction if God gave severe justice its course.

2) That this sinful inclination is hereditary is indirectly contained in the passages cited, although it is not expressly said. Ps. 51: 5, "Behold, I was shapen in iniquity; and in sin did my mother conceive me," directly says that evil is ingrown in man from the first moment of his origin,—for the explanation that here reference is only to the *iniquity* and *sin* of the *parents*, is untenable. So that even the newly-born child is not free from sin, or as Job 14: 4 expresses it, "Who can bring a clean thing out of an unclean? not one."

This transmission of sin takes place with special intensity in *certain races, especially those that have fallen under the divine curse*. This is implied in the history of the Cainites (Gen. 4); of Ham, and especially Canaan (Gen. 9: 25 onward); of Moab and Ammon (Gen. 19: 36 onward); and this is especially expressed in the repeated declaration that God visits the sins of the fathers on the third and fourth generation (Ex. 20: 5; 34: 7; Num. 14: 18; Deut. 5: 9).

[Analysis: 1) Sin is an inclination which rules man; 2) the first sin is that of disobedience; 3) the second that of self-excuse; 4) meaning of Gen. 8: 21; 5) of Ps. 51: 5; 6) of Job 14: 4; 7) of Ex. 20: 5.]

§ 76. Antagonism of the Good and the Evil in Man. Degrees of Sin. Possibility of a Relative Righteousness.

According to the Old Testament, the condition of man in consequence of the Fall is not that of an absolute subjection to sin, which destroys the power of

resistance, but it is an *antagonism* between man's susceptibility to the good and the power of sin. In Gen. 4: 6, 7 are expressed the possibility and the duty of resisting the sinful inclination. According as men seek or do not seek to rule over sin, there arises a difference of relation to God and a difference in the *degree* of sinfulness.

The Old Testament calls the highest degree of sin *obduracy* or *hardening* of the heart. This is the condition in which a man, by continually cherishing sin, has lost the ability to withstand it; and it is added that God can glorify Himself on such a one only by punishment. For it is God's ordinance, that as the power to do good grows by its exercise, so also sin is punished by continued sinning (Ps. 81: 11, 12). This hardening is both a *divine act*, and at the same time the *sinner's own act*, so that the two expressions are interchangeable (compare Ex. 7: 3 with 8: 15, 28; etc.). In the first case, hardening is the effect of the divine wrath (Isa. 64: 5). We must here note as essential, that the Old Testament (like the New) always speaks of hardening only in connection with a divine revelation offered to the sinner, but rejected by him. This is applicable to *Pharaoh*, who sees the miracles of Moses, but whose "heart was hardened" (Ex. 8: 19). In such passages the point is not (as understood by Calvinists) a dark and hidden decree of reprobation, but a divine decree of judgment, well grounded and perfectly manifest.

The course of hardening is described in Isa. 6: 10; incapability to *hear* the divine word and *see* God's way connects itself with dullness of *heart*, and this again reacts on the heart so that its insusceptibility becomes incurable.

On the other hand, in the midst of the sinful world,

a *righteousness* is attained by a cheerful resignation to the divine will, and by the loyalty with which a man accepts the witness of God, given to him in accordance with the then stage of revelation. Enoch walked with God (Gen. 5: 22); Noah is regarded as righteous in the general corruption (Gen. 7: 1); Abraham believed the promise, and it was counted to him for righteousness (Gen. 15: 6). But the Old Testament knows nothing of *absolutely righteous* persons (1 Kings 8: 46; Ps. 143: 2; Isa. 43: 27; Prov. 20: 9; Eccles. 7: 20). The *Mosaic Law* attests this by excepting none from the need of atonement.

[Analysis: 1) The reason there are degrees of sin; 2) hardening of the heart both a divine act and the sinner's own act; 3) hardening of the heart always spoken of in connection with a divine revelation; 4) case of Pharaoh; 5) exposition of Isa. 6: 10; 6) the O. T. knows of no absolutely righteous persons]

CHAPTER XI.

THE MOSAIC DOCTRINE OF DEATH AND THE STATE AFTER DEATH.¹

§ 77. The Connection between Sin and Death.

The *consequence of sin is death*. This is *positively* expressed in Gen. 2: 17. The issue of the punishment is at once placed foremost in the threat, as is generally the case in prophetic announcements. There is no difficulty here from the fact that death did not really follow *immediately after the Fall*, as in reality man entered on the path of death immediately on the commission of sin.

The *punishment of death is connected with disobedience*, not with the effect of the fruit of the tree as many expositors infer from the contrast in Gen. 3: 22. The partaking of the fruit had death as its consequence solely because a decision of the will was involved in it. The intimate connection of sin and death is clear from Gen. 6: 3, though this passage primarily treats only of the shortening of the length of life through sin. According to this passage (the marginal translation of the *Revised Version* is to be preferred "*in their going astray they are flesh*"), the divine spirit of life which supports man is enfeebled by sin, and thus man's vital strength is destroyed; while, as Isaiah (63: 10) expresses himself, the Spirit of God is grieved by sin; it is also repressed as to the physical principle of life, and thus man is subject to mortality.

¹ There is no topic of O. T. theology on which the literature is so rich as on the one in question. The literature of the subject up to the year 1844 is given in Böttcher's learned work, *De Inferis*, etc., 1846. See also Delitzsch, *Biblical Psychology*.

[Analysis: 1) The consequence of sin is death; 2) man immediately entered on the path of death; 3) this punishment is connected with disobedience; 4) the meaning of Gen. 6: 3.]

§ 78. The Doctrine of Mosaism on the Condition after Death.

Death takes place when the divine spirit of life which sustains man is withdrawn by God (Ps. 104: 29), by which means man *expires* (Gen. 7: 21, 22), upon which the body returns to the dust from whence it was taken (Job 34, 14: 15; Eccles. 12: 7 compared with 8: 8). From the whole *connection of Old Testament doctrine*, it is clear that as the *origin* so also the *final destiny* of man's soul is different from that of the soul of an animal (with which it seems to be identified in Ps. 104: 29), and that, when the sustaining spirit of life is withdrawn, although the band by which the *nephesh* (soul) is bound to the body is loosed, the soul itself, and man, so far as his personality lies in the soul continues to exist; yet, he exists only as a weak shadow, which wanders into the kingdom of the dead (Sheol). Man's existence after death is treated in the Old Testament so much as a matter of course, that the reality of it is never the subject of doubt. The doubts with which the Israelitish spirit wrestled referred only to the *how* of existence after death. It is the *nephesh* (soul) which wanders into the kingdom of the dead (Ps. 16: 10; 30: 3; 86: 13; 89: 48; etc.); so also it is the *nephesh* which returns again to the body of the dead child on being restored to life (1 Kings 17: 21, 22). Oehler adduces the narratives of resurrection from the dead (1 Kings 17: 21, 22; 2 Kings 4: 34, 35) as proofs that a close connection between the body just quitted and the soul still subsists *immediately* after death, but maintains on the other hand, that there is no trace in the Old Testament of the *Egyptian*

notion that a continual connection subsists between the soul and body, in virtue of which the preservation of the body secures the continuance of the soul.

The *place* into which man migrates ("the house appointed for all living," Job 30: 23), is called *Sheol*. The word (from *shaal*, to *ask*) characterizes the kingdom of the dead as that which is insatiable in its demands.

The following *essential features of the conception of Sheol* are distinctly presented in the Old Testament:

The kingdom of the dead is supposed to be in the depths (Ps. 86: 13) of the earth (Ps. 63: 10), deeper even than the waters and their inhabitants (Ezek. 26: 20; 31: 14; 32: 18). It agrees with this, that it is a region of thickest *darkness*, "where the light is as darkness" (Job 10: 22). The dead are there gathered in tribes ("gathered to his people," Gen. 25: 8; 35: 29; compare the picture of *Sheol* in Ezek. 32: 17-32).

These terms cannot possibly be referred to the grave. *The kingdom of the dead and the grave are, on the contrary, definitely distinguished.*¹

The *condition* of men in the realm of death is represented as the *privation of all that belongs to life in the full sense*; and so the realm of death is simply called *Abaddon*, that is destruction (Job. 26: 6; Prov. 15: 11; 27: 20). Without strength, dull, and like men in slumber, the dead rest in silence (Ps. 94: 17; 115: 17). *Sheol* is the land of forgetfulness (Ps. 88: 12). "There is no work, nor device, nor knowledge, nor wisdom, in *Sheol*, whither thou goest" (Eccles.

¹ **Schultz:** *Sheol* is not the grave itself. For even where there is no grave *Sheol* is thought of as the abode of the departed (Gen. 37: 35; Num. 16: 30, 33). It is the dwelling-place for the dead, who rest there after the joy and suffering of life. It is "the land of the departed spirits," in contrast to "the land of the living." (Ps. 18: 5; 16: 10).

9: 10). (Compare Eccles. 9: 5, 6). With all this, however, *their consciousness is not destroyed*; their personal identity continues (compare such passages as Isa. 14: 9, 10; Ezek. 32: 21; 1 Sam. 28: 15, 16). It is not possible to ascend or return from the realm of the dead (Job 7: 9; 14: 12). (The Old Testament relates only one example of the appearing of a dead person, Samuel, 1 Sam. 28. This narrative is not to be explained as if we had here a record of a mere deception, as the older theologians interpreted it).

[Analysis: 1) The nature of death; 2) the destiny of man's soul different from that of an animal; 3) the soul continues to exist; 4) goes to Sheol; 5) immortality of the soul never questioned in the O. T.; 6) the question is simply *how*; 7) the *nephesh* leaves the body; 8) a close connection between soul and body immediately after death; 9) but the Egyptian notion is not taught in the O. T.; 10) derivation of the word *Sheol*; 11) the conception of *Sheol* in the O. T.; 12) *Sheol* is not the grave itself; 13) it is the place of the departed spirits; 14) the condition of the soul in the *Sheol*; 15) consciousness of the soul is not destroyed; 16) the appearance of Samuel.]

§ 79. Condition of the Soul in Sheol.

In no part of the Old Testament is a *difference in the lot* of those in the realm of death distinctly spoken of; only in Isa. 14: 15; Ezek. 32: 23, where the fallen conquerors are relegated to the uttermost depths, can we find an indication of different grades in the realm of the dead. Elsewhere, only a division into people and races, and not a division of just and unjust, is spoken of. In itself, the condition in *Sheol*, which is in the main the most *indefinite existence possible*, is neither *blessedness nor positive unblessedness*. The Mosaic retribution has its sphere entirely on this side of the grave (§ 89).

On the *traces of belief in a heavenly life beyond the grave* which have been supposed to be found in the Penta-teuch, the translation of Enoch (Gen. 5: 24) can alone

come into consideration. But that is not a testimony to a higher existence of the soul *after death*; for the meaning of the passage is that Enoch never died,—that is, his body and soul were never separated. In it, as in the history of Elijah's translation (2 Kings 2), there lies rather the declaration, that even before the coming of death's vanquisher some specially favored men were excepted from the curse of death and of the kingdom of death which hangs over man.

But it is clearly expressed in the Pentateuch that *the relation of the righteous to God is not cancelled after death*. The relation into which God entered with the patriarchs continues (Ex. 3: 6 compared with Gen. 26: 24; 28: 13). "I am the God of Abraham, and the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob. God is not the God of the dead, but of the living" (Matt. 22: 32.)

[Analysis: 1) There is a difference in the condition of the souls in Sheol; 2) the translation of Enoch; 3) the soul lives after death.]

SECTION III.

THE ORDINANCES OF MOSAISM.

§ 80. The Nature of the Covenant.

The form in which the Covenant of God with Israel is made (Ex. 19–24), is a contract resting on the promises and engagements of the two contracting parties (Ex. 19: 5, 8; 24: 3, 7). Yet the relation of the parties is not purely mutual. It is Jehovah alone who fixes the conditions of the covenant (Lev. 11:44, 45), and on whom depend the maintenance of the regulations of the treaty and the final realization of the aim of the covenant.

According to its nature, the covenant presents itself under the following heads:

1) The divine act, from which the covenant proceeds, viz., *the divine election*, and the promise annexed to it.

2) *Man's obligation*. He who prescribes the obligation is *God*; that to which man is bound, is the revelation of the divine will in *the law*, especially the *Decalogue*, which is the obligatory document in the stricter sense; but the symbol of obligation is in particular the sign of *circumcision*, imposed on those who are subject to the covenant obligations.

3) Thus according as the nation performs its obligation, the divine *retribution* is determined, which, however, is so carried out that at the end the divine purpose of election must come to be realized.

[Analysis: 1) The covenant is a contract between two parties; 2) the relation of the parties, however, is not purely mutual; 3) the subject will be discussed under three heads.]

CHAPTER XII.

THE DIVINE ELECTION.

§ 81. Israel's Election as the Free Act of God's Love.

The adoption of Israel as the covenant people is a free act of God, or in other words, *an act of divine love, and necessary only so far as God has bound Himself by His oath*—that is, a proof of His truth and faithfulness—but is in no way dependent on man's desert. These propositions are expressly inculcated on the people at every opportunity. It is only on this ground that the divine commands to the people are given, and therefore the Decalogue (Ex. 20: 2) places at its forefront the fact of election. The divine *love* appears here as the first point in the founding of the covenant relation with Israel.

The divine promise is sealed by *the oath of God*, which is given whenever the matter in question is an unchangeable decree, the performance of which is not to depend on contingencies (Heb. 6: 17).

[Analysis: 1) The adoption of Israel is an act of love; 2) it does not depend on man's desert; 3) the promise is sealed by an oath.]

§ 82. Forms of the Expression of this Election.

The divine election of the people is expressed in the following forms: Jehovah is the Father of His people; Israel is His first-born son; His property out of all the nations of the earth; the holy, priestly people. All these ideas are correlated.

1) In the Old Testament the divine *Fatherhood* has an *ethical* meaning. It denotes the relation of love

and moral communion in which Jehovah has placed Israel to Himself. This relation is quite unique; Jehovah is *only the Father of the chosen people*, not the Father of the other nations (Ex. 4: 22, 23; Deut. 32: 6).

The fatherhood of Jehovah was *displayed* in the deliverance of the people from Egypt (Hos. 11: 1); then in the divine guidance through the wilderness, which was a fatherly discipline (Deut. 8: 5; Hos. 11: 3); and so likewise all subsequent redemption and providential guidance of Israel is a manifestation of the divine fatherhood (Isa. 63: 16).

2) The same relation between Israel and God which rests on the divine election is expressed in the appellations—*people of God's possession, a holy people* (Deut. 14: 1, 2). The word *holy* (see § 44) conveys negatively the idea of separation from all other people, and positively of admission or introduction into communion with God (Ex. 19: 4). In virtue of this attitude to God, Israel is a *priestly* people. (Ex. 19: 6). *Vocation to the immediate service of the true God* is the main idea in the priestly character of the covenant people. God sanctifies the people to Himself *positively* by dwelling among them, by His revelation in word and deed, by every institution on which is imprinted the unique relation between Israel and God, and finally, by placing His spirit in the congregation.

3) The *other nations* form a great profane mass. Still, even from the standpoint of Mosaism, the *theocratic exclusiveness is not absolutely exclusive*; for every heathen, dwelling as a stranger in the land, could by circumcision become incorporated among the covenant people, and thus receive a share of all the gracious benefits bestowed on Israel (Ex. 12: 48); with the ex-

ception, however, of the *Canaanitish tribes*, the *Moabites* and *Ammonites* (Deut. 23: 4, 5).

[Analysis: 1) Special names by which the relation of God to Israel is expressed; 2) the meaning of "Fatherhood"; 3) how displayed; 4) the meaning of "holy people"; 5) of "priestly people"; 6) the relations which the Gentiles bore to Israel.]

CHAPTER XIII.

MAN'S OBLIGATION.

§ 83. The Servant of Jehovah.

The *covenant of promise* with Abraham was made upon the condition that he and his descendants bind themselves to a godly life and to obedience to God's will (Gen. 17: 1, 2; 18: 19). The *same condition* is prescribed to the people (Ex. 19: 5), and accepted by the people (Ex. 19: 8; 24: 3). Laid under this obligation to their God, the Israelites are the *servants* of Jehovah, whom He has purchased by redeeming them from Egyptian bondage, and who, therefore are exempt from all earthly lordship by being bound to the service of God (Lev. 25: 42, 55; 26: 13).

The idea of the servant of God is complete only when he who is bound to God also binds himself to God's will, following God perfectly,—the praise which is repeatedly given to Caleb and Joshua as servants of God (Num. 14: 24; 32: 12). Thus to the servant of God belongs the subjective quality of *righteousness*. This word expresses in general the conformity of man to God's will,—his normal relation to God. So far as God's will is *elective* and *promissory*, righteousness consists in full surrender to elective grace and the divine word of promise. So far as the will of God is a *commanding* will, it lies in the fulfilling of God's commands (Deut. 6: 25),

Inasmuch as the name "servant of Jehovah" specially designates the chosen instruments of the divine kingdom, an essential element in the idea is the thought of faithfulness in the house of God, and this

title "servant of Jehovah" is the highest name of honor in the Old Testament applied to Abraham (Gen. 26: 24) and Moses (Num. 12: 7; Josh. 1: 2-7).

[Analysis: 1) The conditions of the covenant; 2) the Israelites are the servants of Jehovah; 3) the meaning of "servant of Jehovah"; 4) the different aspects of the subjective quality "righteousness"; 5) in what special sense Abraham and Moses are designated "servants of Jehovah."]

§ 84. The Law.

The compass of the people's obligations is *the law*, the *fundamental principle* of which is expressed in the words, "Sanctify yourselves, and be ye holy: for I am Jehovah your God" (Lev. 20: 7).

The traditional division of the law of Moses into *moral*, *ceremonial*, and *forensic laws* may serve to facilitate a general view of theocratic ordinances.

The law of Moses, however, does not demand only external conformity to the law, a mere *legality* and not *morality*. On the contrary the law insists on the *disposition of the heart*, when it says, "Thou shalt not covet" (Ex. 20: 17). It demands the external as co-ordinate with the internal. And precisely in this lies an important educating element.

From a right estimate of the law of Moses, the following points have further to be noticed:

1) The *whole ritual ordinances* to which the Israelite is subject, from his circumcision onward, *have a symbolic character*, mirroring the inner process of sanctification, and so forming the instrument of tuition advancing from the outer to the inner man.

2) *The precepts of the law are given in detail mainly on the negative side*; what the Israelites may not do is told with great particularity.¹

¹ The scholastic subtlety of the Rabbins has made out the considerable number of 248 positive commands and 365 prohibi-

3) Finally,—and this is the main point,—we have to look at the *motives* for fulfilling the law which the law presents. All righteousness required by the law presupposes faith in the divine election, in the gracious guidance, and in the promises.

[Analysis: 1) The norm of duty is the law; 2) traditional division of the law; 3) the demands of the law are not simply external; 4) three points must be borne in mind; 5) the subtlety of the Rabbins.]

§ 85. The Decalogue. Its Division.

The Decalogue (“the ten words,” Ex. 34: 28; Deut. 4: 13; 10: 4) stands at the beginning (Ex. 20: 2–17) of *the book of the covenant* (Ex. 20–23). See Ex. 24: 7. It was written on two tables of stone, which, according to Ex. 32: 15, were inscribed on both sides. The number ten characterizes the commandments as a complete whole. The Decalogue is again given in Deut. 5: 6–21.

Of the *division of the Decalogue* there have long been various views. The main schemes of division are *three*, distinguished by the way in which they take the first and the last commandment.

1) The *first* scheme became prevalent in the Roman Catholic Church under the influence of *Augustine*, and has been retained by the Lutheran Church, and in recent times defended by Kurtz and others. It includes in the *first* commandment Ex. 20: 2–6, Deut. 5: 6–10. The *ninth* is generally taken according to the text of Exodus, “Thou shalt not covet thy neighbor’s *house*,” the tenth, “Thou shalt not covet thy neighbor’s *wife*,” etc. Augustine himself, on the contrary, in the main passage in which he treats of this subject, tions. They associated this number with the 365 days of the year and the 248 bones in the human body (according to the physiology of the time).

holds to the text of Deuteronomy for the ninth and tenth commandments, and Kurtz emends the text of Exodus by the aid of Deuteronomy.

2) The *second* and *third* schemes of division agree in making the whole prohibition of concupiscence a single commandment (the *tenth*), but they differ as to the *first* and *second* commandments. According to the view now common among the Jews,—which, however, seems to rest on no ancient tradition,—the *first* commandment, comprises only Ex. 20: 2. This, they say, implies the obligation to *believe* on God as the most Perfect Being. The *second* commandment (Ex. 20: 3–6) then includes the obligation to believe on God's unity and the prohibition of false worship.

3) The *third* scheme, accepted by the Greek and Reformed Churches, and by the Socinians, makes Ex. 20: 3 the *first* commandment; and Ex. 20: 4–6, the *second*. Oehler, on internal grounds, thinks it more probable that verses 2–6 are to be divided, and that the prohibition of concupiscence should not be divided.¹

The Hebrew accentuation of the Decalogue is two-fold—the one accentuation giving the usual Masoretic division into verses, the other regulating the intonation in the Synagogue. The latter takes verses 2–6 together, showing that these five verses were viewed as closely connected. It is also certain that verses 2–6 formed only one *parasha* in the Hebrew Bible, and

¹ He states, however, that Augustine's view (vv. 2–6 are a single commandment), must rest on ancient Jewish tradition, and that the close connection of these verses seems favorable to the Augustinian view. He is not in favor of dividing the prohibition of concupiscence in Ex. 20: 17 (though he thinks it can be justified in Deut. 5: 21), and regards the distinction drawn by the Lutheran theologians between the ninth and tenth commandments (*actual* concupiscence and *original* concupiscence) as a mere invention of polemical zeal.

these small *parashas* are so old that this cannot be due to Christian influence. This is a strong *external* argument for the Romish and Lutheran division of the commandments.

[Analysis: 1) The place of the Decalogue in the Pentateuch; 2) why ten commandments; 3) three schemes of division; 4) the Lutheran view; 5) view of the Reformed Churches; 6) the testimony of the Jewish Church.]

§ 86. The Two Tables of the Decalogue.

The Old Testament does not expressly tell us how the commandments were *divided between two tables*. Three views have generally been held:

1) The arrangement assumed by Philo and Josephus, and accepted by *Oehler*, in which *five* precepts are assigned to each table.

2) The view of Calvin, followed by the Reformed Church, in which *four* precepts are assigned to the first table, and *six*, commencing with the command to honor parents, to the second.

3) The followers of the Augustinian division (the Roman Catholic and Lutheran Churches) generally agree in beginning the second table with the commandment to honor parents, assigning *three* commandments to the first table and *seven* to the second, a division which has also this in its favor that it makes the writing on each table nearly equal in amount. On this view the number *three* has been associated with the Trinity, and it is urged that *seven* in the second is a holy number.

The definitive and rounded character of the Decalogue is a decisive proof that it *retains its original form*.

[Analysis: 1) The two tables; 2) three views held as to the number of commandments on each table.]

§ 87. The Historical Origin of Circumcision.

The main sign of the covenant is *circumcision* (Gen. 17: 11), which is the constant symbol of covenant obligations, and of consequent covenant rights. It was prescribed not only for Israelites by birth, but also for all who were received into the house as slaves (Gen. 17: 12–27 compared with Ex. 12: 44–48). On new-born boys it was performed on the eighth day (Gen. 17: 12; Lev. 12: 3).

The *historical origin* and the *religious import* of circumcision must be carefully distinguished. It is possible that the rite was customary in other tribes before it was introduced in the race of Abraham. But this does not justify the inference that the *significance* of circumcision in the Old Testament must be explained from heathenism.

[Analysis: 1) The sign of the covenant; 2) circumcision practised also by other nations; 3) its significance not to be explained from heathenism.]

§ 88. Religious Import of Circumcision in the Old Testament. The Giving of a Name.

Circumcision obviously presupposes that the natural life is tainted by impurity, which must be removed in those who are called to covenant fellowship with God. It may be named, with Ewald, “the offering of the body;” and this is carried out in a way that shall declare the propagation of the race of revelation to be consecrated to God. Circumcision is essentially distinguished from Christian baptism by not constituting an *immediate*, personal relation between God and the recipient of the ordinance. It does not operate as an individual means of grace. Circumcision is no vehicle of sanctifying forces, as it makes no

demand in reference to the internal state of the recipient. The rite effects admission to the fellowship of the covenant people as an *opus operatum*, securing to the individual as a member of the nation his share in the promises and saving benefits granted to the nation as a whole. On the other hand circumcision certainly makes ethical demands on him who *has* received it. It binds him to obedience to God, whose covenant sign he bears in his body and to a blameless walk before Him (Gen. 17: 1). Thus it is the *symbol of the renewal and purification of heart*.

With circumcision was combined the *naming of the child*, which although it is first expressly mentioned in Luke 1: 59; 2: 21, is clearly indicated by the connection of Gen. 17: 5 with what follows, and Gen. 21: 3, 4. How frequently the giving of a name was in Israel an act of religious confession, is seen in the meanings of numerous biblical proper names. A religious consecration *for girls* is neither presented at the institution of circumcision, nor at a later date. This agrees with the dependent position of woman, who has a part in national and covenant life only as the partner of man—as wife and mother. Girls are said to have been named when weaned.

[Analysis: 1) Circumcision presupposes that the natural life is tainted by impurity; 2) it is “the offering of the body”; 3) is essentially distinguished from Christian baptism; 4) is the symbol of the renewal and purification of heart; 5) with it was combined the naming of the child; 6) the giving of a name was an act of religious confession; 7) the dependent position of woman in the O. T.]

CHAPTER XIV.

DIVINE RETRIBUTION.

§ 89. **Blessing and Curse.**

As the people bound themselves when the covenant was concluded to observe the law, so Jehovah on His part binds Himself to fulfil to the nation, so long as it observes its obligations, all the promises He makes, and to grant it the fullness of His blessing; but in the opposite case, to execute on the people the punishment of a breach of the covenant (Lev. 26: 23, 24; Deut. 32: 21; Ps. 18: 26: 27).

The *divine blessing* in a single word is *Life* (Deut. 30: 15, 16). Life embraces all the good things that pertain to earthly prosperity: long life (Deut. 4: 40), children, fertility of the soil, victory over enemies (Lev. 26: 3, 4; Deut. 28: 1—14). But the earthly good things form a state of felicity only when the possession of them is united with the experience of the gracious presence of the covenant God, so that they are pledges of His favor.

On the other hand, the result of *the breaking of the covenant* on the part of the people issues in *the withdrawal of all these blessings*, shortening of life, childlessness, scarcity and famine,—that Israel may know that it possesses all natural blessings only as a gift of God (Hos. 2: 8—12); also political misfortune, and defeat by foes. *Four* judicial plagues are prominently mentioned in Ezek. 14: 21 and other passages,—the sword, famine, wild beasts, and pestilence.

[**Analysis:** 1) The conditions of the covenant; 2) in what the divine blessing was to consist; 3) the punishment threatened if the covenant is broken; 4) the four judicial plagues.]

§ 90. Solution of the Apparent Contradiction between Divine Election and the Mosaic Doctrine of Retribution.

But if Israel by breaking the covenant is exposed to God's judgment and rejected, this seems to nullify God's decree of election and the realization of the aim of His kingdom, which, though secured by God's covenant oath, is again dependent on man's action. *God's compassionate love is higher than His penal justice* (Ex. 34: 6, 7). God's faithfulness cannot be broken by man's faithlessness. His judgments have a fixed end, and therefore are always in measure, as is taught in the beautiful parable in Isa. 28: 23-29. They are so executed that Israel is thereby brought back to God, and the perfecting of God's kingdom secured. Israel is not annihilated in the judgment; even in banishment, in dispersion among the nations, it must not coalesce with them, but be preserved as a separate nation for the fulfilment of its vocation. According to Deut. 30: 1-6, the final restoration of the people is *an act of God*, but is effected by *ethical means*, through the *conversion* of the people, for the order of God's kingdom excludes all magical means. Thus, in spite of man's sin and faithlessness, the realization of the divine decree of election, the perfecting of the people of God, is firmly based on God's faithfulness and mercy (Rom. 11: 25-36).

[Analysis: 1) The aim of God's kingdom will be realized; 2) God's faithfulness is not broken by man's faithlessness; 3) the aim of God's judgments; 4) there shall be a final restoration of God's people; 5) an act of God effected by ethical means; 6) the meaning of Isa. 28: 23-29; 7) of Rom. 11: 25-36.]

SECTION IV.

THE THEOCRACY.

§ 91. The Idea of the Divine Kingship.

The form of government in the commonwealth founded by Moses is the *government of God*—the theocracy. *Jehovah is the King of Israel*. The Old Testament idea of the divine kingship expresses, not God's general relation of power toward the world (as being its creator and preserver), but the special relation of His government toward His elect people. The real beginning of His kingly rule was on that day on which He bound the tribes of Israel into a community by the promulgation of the law and the forming of the legal covenant: "And He was King in Jeshurun" (Deut. 33: 5). (It is wrong to take Moses for the subject). Although Jehovah has been the King of His people in all ages (Ps. 74: 12), He will not become the King of nations until a future time, when He comes in the last revelation of His Kingdom. As King, He is the *Lawgiver* and *Judge* of His people (Isa. 33: 22). As King, God is also the *leader of His people's army*. Israel forms the hosts of Jehovah (Ex. 12. 41).

[Analysis: 1) The meaning and derivation of "theocracy"; 2) the beginning of the kingly rule; 3) as king He is the lawgiver and judge; 4) and the leader of the armies of Israel.]

CHAPTER XV.

THEOCRATIC ORGANIZATION OF THE PEOPLE.

§ 92. The Division into Tribes. Israel's Representation before Jehovah.

Although Levi received no special tribal territory, the number twelve still remains for all political relations, and wherever Levi is numbered, the two tribes of Joseph appear as only one. This number twelve is so entirely identified with the normal state of the theocracy, that it continues to be the signature of God's people even in prophecy. In the New Testament, too, the *twelve* tribes continue to be the type of the covenant people (Acts 26: 7; Rev. 7: 4–8), to which the number of the apostles corresponds.

These twelve tribes together form the priestly kingdom (Ex. 19: 6). On account of their uncleanness and sinfulness the congregation are able to draw near to God only by means of a *propitiation*. A whole series of institutions is directed to such propitiation; but this thought is pre-eminently expressed by the introduction of a *representative* body between Jehovah and the people. There are three grades in the representation of the people before Jehovah: 1) *Levi as a tribe* appears in a mediatorial position between Jehovah and the people (Ex. 32: 26–30); 2) the *race of Aaron* rises from its midst with a specific priestly prerogative (Ex. 28: 1; Num. 18: 7); 3) *the office of high priest* which is the culmination of the priesthood.

[Analysis: 1) The number twelve; 2) the twelve tribes form the priestly kingdom; 3) a propitiation necessary; 4) there must be a representative body between God and His people; 5) three grades in this representation.]

§ 93. The Mode and Meaning of the Representation of Israel by the Levites.

We are told, in Ex. 13, that from the night in which Israel was redeemed, all the first-born males among man and beast were dedicated to Jehovah. But instead of all the first-born sons then living from a month old and upward, He accepts the Levites as a standing gift of the people (Num. 8: 16); and instead of the people's cattle, he takes the cattle of the Levites (Num. 3: 11-13). (Since the number of first-born sons in the nation amounts to 22,273, and the number of the Levites, on the contrary, only to 22,000, the over-plus is compensated by a fine of five shekels apiece, to be paid to Aaron and his sons (Num. 3: 43-51).

The Levites were thus, 1) the living *sacrifice* by which the people rendered *payment* to Jehovah for owing their existence to Him; and 2) since the Levites, in consequence of this, performed in the sanctuary the service which the people ought to have rendered through their first-born, but could not on account of their uncleanness (Num. 18: 22, 23), they serve, in their substitution, as a *covering* or an atonement also for the people who come near to the sanctuary (Num. 8: 19).

The middle books of the Pentateuch give special emphasis to the difference between the priests and the Levites, while Deuteronomy, on the contrary, takes priests and Levites together, as one holy estate in distinction from the people. These two views do not contradict, but supplement each other. Deuteronomy, however, very clearly distinguishes between the Levites who were priests and those who were not (Deut. 18: 3-8; 27: 9, 12).¹

¹ Delitzsch in Riehm: That the legislation in the middle books

[Analysis: 1) The Levites were accepted instead of all the first-born; 2) they were the living sacrifice offered by the people; 3) they were substitutes for the people; 4) difference of presentation between the books of the Pentateuch; 5) these views supplement each other; 6) the priestly legislation does not date from the time of Ezekiel or from a later time.]

§ 94. Official Function, Dedication, and Social Position of the Levites.

The *official functions* of the Levites are definitely distinguished from those of the priests. The charge "of everything of the altar, and of that within the veil" (Num. 18: 7), falls exclusively to the priests. On the contrary, the service of the Levites is called the service of Jehovah's *tabernacle*, or of the *tent of meeting* (Num. 1: 53; 16: 9; 18: 4), and was organized in a military manner. During the wandering in the wilderness, the Levites had the charge of the taking down, carrying, and setting up of the holy tabernacle (Num. 1: 50-53); also of the carrying of the sacred furniture, particularly the ark of the covenant (Deut. 10: 8; 31: 25). The division of these duties among the three Levitical families is given in Num. 3: 25-37; 4: 1-49. But the functions mentioned in the book of Numbers refer only to the time of the people's *wandering*. There are no directions in the Pentateuch concerning the services of the Levites during the *settlement* of the people of the Holy Land.¹

The *act of the consecration* of the Levites is described in Num. 8: 5-22. The purification falls into three

of the Pentateuch is not of a date after the time of Ezekiel follows necessarily from the fact that the official position and division of the Levites after the exile was in a stage of development, which is not reflected, either as to fact or language, in the legislation.

¹ The Levites were called to this service from their thirtieth to their fiftieth year (Num. 4: 3, 23, 30), but from Num. 8: 24, 25, we infer that the young men began their training for entering on the full service, in their twenty-fifth year.

parts (Num. 8: 7): 1) *sprinkling*; 2) *shaving*; 3) *washing of clothes*. Their *presentation* before the Lord is divided into the following ceremonies: 1) *the laying on of hands*; 2) the *wave offering*;¹ 3) the *sinoffering*; 4) the *burnt offering* (Num. 8: 10–12).

In order that the tribe of Levi might be withdrawn from ordinary labor and give itself completely to its sacred vocation, *no inheritance as a tribe* was assigned to it (Num. 18: 23). The tribe is scattered among all the other tribes, in the territories of which it received 48 towns with their suburbs for pasturages (Num. 35: 6, 7), of which six are appointed to be cities of refuge. In this law, moreover, the priests are included along with the Levites. The tithes were assigned to them *for their support*, which, moreover, was not an over-abundant endowment, so that the tribe of Levi was often subjected to unavoidable poverty. (Deut. 12: 19; 14: 27, 29).

[Analysis: 1) The duty of the priests; 2) the service of the Levites; 3) the special charge of each of the three Levitical families; 4) time of service; 5) the purification falls into three parts; 6) with the presentation four ceremonies were connected; 7) the reason no inheritance was given to them; 8) place of residence; 9) their support.]

§ 95. The Priesthood.

The design of the priestly vocation is 1) to represent the nation as a holy congregation before Jehovah, with full divine authority (Deut. 18: 5), and to open up for it access to its God. In the functions of his office the priest is the medium of the intercourse which takes place in worship between Jehovah and the congregation, and which on account of the sinfulness of the congregation, becomes a service of atone-

¹ A *waving*,—in the case of the Levites, it is generally understood as a simple leading backward and forward.

ment. Besides this mediatorial calling, the priest has 2) the office of teacher and interpreter of the law (Lev. 10: 11), in which respect he has to accomplish a divine mission to the people. The two sides of the priestly calling are embraced together in Deut. 33: 10.

The divine calling to the priesthood is connected with the natural propagation of Aaron's family.

The holiness of the priesthood was to be reflected in the whole appearance of the priests, which was to suggest the highest purity and exclusive devotion to God. To this refer all the provisions as to the *bodily condition and regulation of life* of the priests. The law treats of the bodily condition of the priests in Lev. 21: 16–24. The provisions for the *regulation of life* are given in Lev. 21: 1–9. Propriety and order must rule in the priest's family (Lev. 21: 9). *Dietetic* directions are given in Lev. 10: 9, 10; 22: 8. It is supposed that the rule concerning the *age* of the Levites (30–50, Num. 4: 3, 23, 30) held good of the priests also.

The *consecration* of the priests is prescribed in Ex. 29: 1–37. The consecration consists of two classes of acts:

1) The real consecration of the person to the priestly office in three acts: 1) *washing*, a symbol of spiritual cleansing; 2) *robing*, consisting in putting on four articles of dress (Ex. 28: 40–42) of fine, shining white linen (Ex. 28: 39), as a symbol of purity; 3) the priestly *anointing*, a symbol of the communication of the Divine Spirit which operates in the priestly office.

2) A *three-fold offering*, by which the persons thus consecrated were put into all the functions and rights of the priesthood: 1) the sin-offering (Lev. 8: 14, 15); 2) the burnt-offering; 3) a modified thank offering (Lev. 8: 22–28), which last was the specific sacrifice

for the consecration of the priests. (Blood was sprinkled upon the *ear* of the priest, because he must at all times hearken to the holy voice of God; upon the *hand*, because he must execute God's commands, and especially the priestly functions; upon the *foot*, because he must walk rightly and holily). The conclusion of the festival is the sacrificial meal. The duration of the consecration is fixed at seven days (Ex. 29: 35-37). Although the priestly service demands only outward purity and perfection, still the *real subjective qualification for the priesthood* lies in the undivided devotion to God (Lev. 10: 3).

For their *maintenance* the priests received as dwelling places 13 of the towns which were given to the Levites (Josh. 21: 4), and the Levites had to give them tithes of their tithes, and they received the gifts of the first-fruits, and certain parts of the offerings. In comparison with the endowments of the priestly caste in many other ancient nations, the provision for the Levitical priests is very moderate.

[Analysis: 1) The two-fold office of the priest; 2) all the priests were of the family of Aaron; 3) laws pertaining to the bodily condition of the priests; 4) to the regulation of the life; 5) dietetic directions; 6) the three acts of consecration; 7) a three-fold offering; 8) significance of certain symbolical actions; 9) subjective qualification for the priesthood; 10) the maintenance of the priests.]

§ 96. The High Priest.

In the *high priest* (Lev. 21: 10) are united the mediatorship by which the people are represented before God, and the official priestly sanctity by which they are reconciled. He is said to bear the iniquity of the holy things (Ex. 28: 38). Thus the whole reconciling and sanctifying effect of the sacrifices is dependent on the existence of a personally reconciling mediator-

ship before God; and here the Old Covenant proclaims its inadequacy to effect a true reconciliation, in the fact that even the high priest himself has need of reconciliation and purification by the blood of sacrifices, as one subject to sin and weakness (compare Heb. 5: 3).

As the "holy one of Jehovah" (Ps. 106: 16) he must awaken, by his whole appearance, an impression of the highest purity and exclusive devotion to God. To this end are directed 1) all the regulations in regard to his personal condition and mode of life, which in respect to descent and bodily constitution do not differ from that of other priests. 2) The rules, however, in Lev. 21: 10–15, in regard to the ordering of his life, relate exclusively to the high priest.

The high priest's *consecration to his office* differed from that of the common priests with reference to the *robing* and *anointing*. On his robing, see Ex. 29: 5–9; Num. 20: 26–28 (in this latter passage we see that the transference of the office of high priest from Aaron to Eleazar took place by the transference of the ornaments of office). Without the ornaments of his office, the high priest is simply a private individual, who, as such, cannot intercede for the people; therefore he is threatened with death, if he appear before Jehovah without them. The description of the high priest's official garments is given in Ex. 28 and 39.

This dress of office has received very various symbolic interpretations. The reference to the reconciling mediatorship is especially marked by the fact that the high priest, when clothed with the Ephod, bears the names of the twelve tribes on his *heart* and shoulders. This latter fact is meant to signify that he as Mediator carries, as it were, the people of God,—that, so to speak, the people lie as a burden on him.

From his *unction*, which followed his robing, the high priest was called "the anointed priest."

In addition to the functions of the common priests, the service on the day of atonement, and the Urim and Thummim, were especially assigned to the high priest.

[Analysis: 1) The office of the high priest; 2) the O. T. proclaims that it cannot effect a true reconciliation; 3) he is the "holy one of Jehovah"; 4) special rules regarding his life; 5) consecration to his office; 6) his official garments; 7) the symbolic meaning of the Ephod; 8) the special functions of the high priest.]

CHAPTER XVI.

THE THEOCRATIC AUTHORITY.

§ 97. The Legislative Authority.

In virtue of the principles of the theocracy, *all the powers in the State are united in Jehovah*; even when the congregation acts, it is in His name. He is first the *Lawgiver* (Isa. 33: 22). His legislative power He exercised *through Moses*. The fundamental law given through him is inviolably valid for all time. In the development of the theocracy, the need of receiving an immediate proclamation of Jehovah's kingly will must always appear. This need was met by the *Urim* and *Thummim*, through which the high priest, in whose breastplate they were set, received the decision of Jehovah (Num. 27: 21); and this is why the breastplate bears the name of "the breastplate of judgment" (Ex. 28: 30). The term *Urim* refers to the divine illumination, *Thummim* to the unimpeachable correctness of the decision (1 Sam. 14: 41). It cannot be determined from the Old Testament *how the decision took place*, whether the divine answer came by the sparkling of the jewels (Rabbinical tradition), or by divine *inspiration* of the high priest (so Baehr and Hengstenberg). It is not quite clear from Ex. 28: 30; Lev. 8: 8, whether the Urim and Thummim were different from the gems of the breastplate or not. We should expect to have a more particular description of them if they were anything distinct.

The *sacred lot* seems to have been different from the Urim and Thummim. It was employed at the divi-

sion of the tribal territories (Num. 26: 55, 56); to discover the guilty one who had brought a curse on the people (Josh. 7. 14, 15); and in 1 Sam. 14; 41 (unless the Urim and Thummim are meant) and at the election of the king (1 Sam. 10: 20, 21). (See also Prov. 18: 18). These methods of inquiring into the Divine Will will retire into the background the more *prophecy* becomes prominent. We read in Deut. 18: 18–20, how Moses, before parting from the people, led them to look for the sending forth of new organs of revelation,—the prophets.

[Analysis: 1) Jehovah is at the head of the state; 2) He exercised His legislative power through Moses; 3) immediate decisions were given through the Urim and Thummim; 4) the use of the sacred lot.]

§ 98. The Principle and Organization of the Administration of Justice.

The administration of justice is, in virtue of the principles of theocracy, only an efflux of the divine judgment. “The judgment is God’s” (Deut. 1: 17); to seek justice is to inquire of God (Ex. 18: 15), etc. The theocratic ordinances limit the power of the head of a family, by taking from him (Deut. 21: 18, 19; Ex. 21: 20) the power over life and death of those belonging to him, which he still exercised in the time of the patriarchs (Gen. 38: 24). Lynch law is also forbidden because the office of avenger is God’s alone (Lev. 19: 18). The old custom of blood revenge is indeed retained, but it is subjected to theocratic regulations.

With regard to the organization of the courts of justice, we must distinguish in the Pentateuch the provisions given only for the march through the wilderness, and the regulations in Deuteronomy, which had reference to later circumstances.

In these later regulations the administration of

justice is placed in the hands of the congregation. A very vivid description of the way in which courts were held in Israel is given by the story of the judgment of Naboth (1 Kings 21: 1-16). The community exercises its judicial power by special judges, who are placed in all the gates (Deut. 16: 18).

[Analysis: 1) It is God who gives judgment; 2) the power over life and death; 3) lynch law; 4) blood revenge; 5) courts of justice in the wilderness; 6) the regulations in Deuteronomy; 7) the judgment of Naboth; 8) the judges in the gates.]

§ 99. The Course of Justice and Punishment.

The course of justice is very simple. The parties must both appear in person before the judge, and the complaint is brought before the judges by *word of mouth*, either by the parties (Deut. 21: 20; 22: 16), or by others (Deut. 25: 1). The business of the judge is to hear and thoroughly investigate. The testimony of *witnesses* is the most usual form of evidence and special emphasis is laid upon this. It is enacted that *two* or *three* witnesses shall be brought (Deut. 19: 15), particularly in criminal cases (Num. 35: 30; Deut 17: 6). The *oath* is also a means of evidence (oath of purgation, Ex. 22: 6-10); adjuration of a wife who was accused of adultery (Num. 5: 11-31). The form of the sentence of judgment is not laid down. As a rule, execution immediately followed on condemnation (Num. 15: 36; Deut. 22: 18; 25: 2).

The Mosaic *principle of punishment* is the *jus talionis*: it shall be done to him who has offended as he has done (Ex. 21: 23-25); in other words, the punishment is a retribution corresponding in quantity and quality to the wicked deed. The *punishment of death* is attached apparently to a large number of crimes (Ex. 21: 12-29; Lev. 20: 1-27; etc.). In general, in all cases where the people did not execute judg-

ment on the transgressor, Jehovah Himself reserves the exercise of justice (see, as main passage, Lev. 20: 4-6).

In the Mosaic law, *corporal chastisement* (stripes) appears as another form of punishment (Deut. 25: 2, 3), also fines (Ex. 21: 22; Lev. 24: 18). The *jus talionis* was to be recognized in case of bodily injury (Ex. 21: 23-25). There occurs also the judicial *selling of a guilty person*.

With what emphasis the law demands the strict and impartial administration of justice, especially with reference to the poor, see Ex. 23: 6-8; Lev. 19: 15; etc.

[Analysis: 1) The different features of a trial; 2) the oath; 3) the execution of the punishment; 4) the *jus talionis*; 5) the punishment of death; 6) the corporal chastisement; 7) justice must be shown to the poor.]

§ 100. The Executive Power.

Mosaic theocracy presents the peculiar phenomenon of being originally unprovided with a definite office for *executing* the power of the state. The princes of the tribes (spoken of in Num. 1: 16, 44; and elsewhere) form no theocratic body. Jehovah Himself acts, as circumstances demand, in the immediate exercise of power, in order to execute His kingly will and to maintain the covenant law; but for the rest, only the assurance is expressed (Num. 27: 16, 17) that Jehovah will not leave His congregation as a flock without a shepherd, but will always, again and again, appoint a leader over them and endow him with His Spirit, as He raised up Joshua in Moses' stead, and afterward the Judges. This want of a regular executive in the Mosaic constitution has been thought very remarkable. But the theocratic constitution does not rest on the calculations of a clever founder of

religion, but on the stability of the counsel of revelation.

Yet Deuteronomy, in *the law concerning* a king (Deut. 17: 14–20) leaves open the possibility of setting up an earthly kingship (compare, moreover, the previous prophecy in Gen. 17: 6, 16; 35: 11; Num. 24: 17). This future kingship is, however, subjected strictly to the theocratic principle. The people shall only set over them as king *one whom Jehovah shall choose out of their midst*. Moreover, the stability of his kingship and its descent to his children are to depend on his obedience to the law.

[Analysis: 1) No provision was made for executing the power of the state; 2) Jehovah Himself acts; 3) He promises to appoint a leader; 4) the law concerning a king; 5) the king is strictly subjected to the theocratic principle.]

CHAPTER XVII.

THE ORGANIZATION OF THE FAMILY.

§ 101. The Subdivisions of the Tribes. The Principles and Division of Mosaic Family Law.

The tribes are naturally divided into *clans*; these into families or houses, generally called *fathers' houses*; then follows the various *householders*, with those that belong to them.

Each family forms a self-contained whole, which, so far as possible, is to be preserved in its integrity. Each Israelite is a citizen of the theocracy only by being a member of a certain clan of the covenant people; hence the value of genealogical tables.

The following points are the most important for Biblical Theology: 1) The law of marriage; 2) The relation of parents and children; 3) The law of inheritance, and the provisions touching the continuance of a family and its possessions, (the avenging of blood goes along with this); 4) the law concerning servants.

[Analysis: 1) Subdivisions of the tribes; 2) the value of genealogical tables; 3) principal points of discussion.]

§ 102. The Contracting of Marriage. The Dependent Position of the Wife, and the Forms of the Marriage Contract.

In the Mosaic law, *woman* appears not, indeed, in the position of degradation which she has among most other Oriental nations, but *still dependent*, inasmuch as her will is subject before marriage to the will of her father, and after marriage to the will of her

husband; it is only when this tie is loosed that the wife holds a position of relative independence (Num. 30: 4–10). The *marriage contract* is generally supposed to have rested on a bargain made between the parents of the bride and bridegroom, in virtue of which a price was paid to the *father* of the bride for his daughter, but according to others no such selling took place, a present being sent to the *bride* by the bridegroom, to which other presents were added for the kinsfolk of the bride (Gen. 24: 53, 58; 34: 12). It is most probable that *various forms of the marriage contract* existed side by side. The law does not require a *religious consecration* of the matrimonial tie; but it is clear from Mal. 2: 14 that marriage was to be regarded a divinely sanctioned bond. *Purity* of entrance into the married state is guarded by such laws as Deut. 22: 13–21, 28, 29. The wife's dependent place favored the spread of *polygamy*, although this was in contradiction to the Mosaic idea (§69).

[Analysis: 1) Woman is regarded as dependent; 2) the nature of the marriage contract; 3) various forms of this contract; 4) marriage was regarded as a divinely sanctioned bond; 5) polygamy a contradiction to the Mosaic idea.]

§ 103. Bars to Marriage.

In the Mosaic law of marriage, the provisions concerning *obstacles to marriage* occupy an important place. These provisions are contained in Lev. 18: 6–18; 20: 11–21; Deut. 27: 20; 22, 23. All marriages with near relations are forbidden, and that not only with blood relations, but also with connections by affinity. The marriage of uncle and niece (Lev. 18: 6–13), with the widow of a mother's brother, and a wife's sister after the wife's death, was allowed (Lev. 18: 18). This last case is the famous point of controversy so often discussed in the English Parlia-

ment. But there can be no doubt upon the matter whatever. The prohibition mentioned in Lev. 18:18 (that a man may not marry two sisters), refers expressly only to the time when the wife still lives; marrying both at the same time, as the patriarch Jacob did, was forbidden.

The moral ground of these prohibitions can be no other than the fact that moral fellowship is already constituted through the natural forms of near relationship, which would be disturbed by the matrimonial bond. Abraham's marriage with his half-sister, for this is the most probable view of his relation to Sarah, seems, from the Mosaic standpoint, to have been justified mainly because through it alone the pollution of the race of revelation by heathen elements was prevented (Gen. 24: 3).

[Analysis: 1) Marriages forbidden in the O. T. 2) a famous point of controversy; 3) the moral ground of these prohibitions.]

§ 104. The Dissolution of Marriage.

The dissolution of marriage can take place in two ways: 1) By the disruption in fact of the matrimonial bond by the sin of *adultery*; 2) By a *divorce* drawn up in a definite form.

1) In the Mosaic law, *adultery* is so understood that it is only committed through the unchastity of a *wife*. On the part of the husband, adultery is committed only when he dishonors the *free* wife of another; in this case both are to be punished with death (Lev. 20: 10; Deut. 22: 22). By simple unchastity the husband offends indeed against the law which condemns as an abomination all fornication, and especially such prostitution as was committed among the neighboring heathen nations (Lev. 19: 29; Deut. 23: 18), but not

against his wife. For the trial of a woman suspected of adultery see Num. 5: 11-31.

2) *Divorce*. The right of divorce belongs to the husband only; divorce is therefore called the dismissal of a wife. This right of dismissing a wife is not formally sanctioned by the law, but is presupposed as existing, and is limited not only by the law in Deut. 22: 19, 29, but even in the law of divorce (Deut. 24: 1-4). Such a formal *bill of divorcement*, no doubt, often prevented a too hasty repudiation. Deut. 24: 1 assigns as the ground which renders divorce admissible "some unseemly thing in the woman." The school of *Hillel* understood the expression to mean any matter of offence (*e.g.*, if the wife have let the dinner burn; etc.); but the school of *Shammai* referred it to really shameful conduct, such as unchaste behavior and the like.

It is clear that this whole matter of divorce does not correspond to the idea of marriage proper in the Old Testament (§ 69), and this is expressly set forth by Christ (Matt. 19: 3-8).

[Analysis: 1) The Mosaic law of adultery; 2) of divorce; 3) Christ's teaching.]

§ 105. The Relation of Parents to Children.

The same promise is given to the honoring of parents as to the obedience to the divine will in general (Ex. 20: 12, compared with Deut. 4: 40; 6: 2; etc.). Breach of the reverence due to parents is punished in the same way as offences against the reverence due to God (Ex. 21: 15, 17; Lev. 20: 9). Still the parents have only such rights over their children as is consistent with the acknowledgment of God's higher right of property, which is sealed by circumcision. This thought is conveyed particularly in the ordinance with reference to the redemption of the first-

born sons. Even the human right of parents over their children is limited, in particular, the father has no right over the life and death of his children (such as the Roman law concedes) Deut. 21: 18–21).

The law also requires that a holy education in the fear and love of God be given to children (Deut. 4: 9, 10; 6: 6, 7; etc.). But the Pentateuch knows nothing of a scholastic inculcation of the divine laws; it knows no formal religious instruction at all.¹ The Rabbinical tradition that boys in their twelfth year were bound to fulfil the law may be very ancient, but the earliest indication of this rule which we have is in the history of Jesus when He was twelve years old, and in Josephus' statement, that Samuel was called to be a prophet in the twelfth year of his life.

[Analysis: 1) Duty of honoring parents; 2) human right of parents is limited; 3) children must be educated in the fear of God; 4) singing a factor in education; 5) Rabbinical tradition.]

§ 106. The Law of Inheritance. Laws Concerning Heiresses and the Levirate Marriage.

After the father's death the *first-born son* is the head of the family. By the law in Deut. 21: 17, the provision that the first-born son is to receive a double inheritance is confirmed, and therefore, doubtless, the care of the mother and unmarried sisters, was incumbent on him. For the rest, the rule of inheritance was apparently that the other sons inherited equally. For the law of inheritance if an Israelite left behind no son, see Num. 27: 8–11. Daughters who were heiresses might marry only men of the tribe of their father (Num. 36: 6–12).

Side by side with this last ordinance stands the

¹ Singing was a vehicle for the propagation of religious knowledge, which we can show to have been cultivated in Israel from the earliest period of the nation's history.

Levirate law which was legally sanctioned by Deut. 25: 5–10. The exposition of this law is doubtful. Some hold that this law applied only to that brother who was in the position to take up the Levirate duty.¹ Again the words, “if he have no son,” are understood by the Jewish and many Christian expositors of childlessness in general, so that if there was a daughter to be heiress, no Levirate marriage would be entered on; and for this the expressions in Matt. 22: 25 (“having no seed”) and Luke 20: 28 (“childless”) seem to speak. This passage in the Gospels shows that the Levirate law was still in force in the time of Jesus.

[Analysis: 1) The first-born was the head of the family; 2) the law of inheritance; 3) the Levirate law; 4) explanation of the law.]

§ 107. Provisions concerning the Preservation of the Family Inheritance.

An inheritance was given to each family by Jehovah for its subsistence, as a hereditary feudal holding, and was therefore in itself inalienable,—which was to be preserved entire as far as possible. When an Israelite is compelled by poverty to alienate his inheritance, this is only for a time, and the land itself is never actually sold, but only what it bore (Lev. 25: 23–28). It might be redeemed at any time by the former possessor or by his nearest relative. In the year of Jubilee, moreover, every possession is to return to the family to which it originally belonged, without redemption.

[Analysis: 1) Property was preserved to each individual family; 2) land could never be absolutely sold; 3) fell back to the original owner in the year of Jubilee.]

¹ If the dead man left no brother who could enter on the duty of marriage, the obligation passed to the nearest relative, who received by the marriage also the right of inheritance.

§ 108. The Avenging of Blood.

In the Old Testament, *blood revenge* is taken for granted as a very ancient custom (Gen. 27: 45). Mosaism, in virtue of its idea of man as the divine image, discerns in murder, a transgression against the Creator and Lord of human life (Gen. 9: 5, 6), which must be atoned for "by the blood of him that shed it" (Num. 35: 33).¹ But because the family is injured at the same time by the murder, the execution of the avenging of blood is laid on "the avenger of blood," the nearest blood relation, who has to redeem the blood taken from the family by the crime committed. The laws regulating the avenging of blood are found in Ex. 21: 12-14; Num. 35: 9, 34; Deut. 19: 1-13.

1) *Two kinds of murder* are distinguished (Num. 35: 9-34) in reference to which the avenging of blood is commanded—*a*) if any one strike another in such a way that death may be foreseen to be the probable consequence (*vv.* 16-18); *b*) if one has slain another out of hatred, or by design, or out of enmity (*vv.* 20, 21). On the other hand, in order to shelter from vengeance him who has slain a man *undesignedly* and *inadvertently*, the law provided for the selection of *six free cities*, three on the east, and three on the west side of the Jordan (Deut. 4: 41-43; Josh. 20: 1-9).

2) For *intentional* murder, there was no other expiation than the blood of the manslayer (Num. 35: 31, 33).

3) The avenging of blood falls upon the *doer* alone, the avenger of blood was not allowed to lay hands on the family of the murderer. That the custom was

¹ Human life is so sacred that even the animal by which a man is killed must be stoned, Ex. 21: 28-32; Gen. 9: 5.

still in force in David's time appears from 2 Sam. 14: 6-11.

[Analysis: 1) Blood revenge a very ancient custom; 2) underlying principle; 3) the avenger is the nearest blood relation; 4) the laws regulating the custom; 5) two kinds of murder distinguished; 6) the case of an accidental killing; 7) no expiation for intentional murder; 8) the family of the murderer could not be touched; 9) custom existed for a long time.]

§ 109. Bondage in the Time of the Patriarchs. The Principles of the Rights of Bondmen.

The Old Testament, in ascribing to man the nature and dignity of one made in the image of God,—in teaching, further, the descent of all mankind from one blood,—pronounces in advance that slavery is inadmissible. It is designated as a *curse* when a race falls into slavery (Gen. 9: 25, 27). Nevertheless, the existence of a state of servitude is presupposed in the Old Testament. How elevated, however, the position of the slave in the time of the patriarchs is shown specially in the beautiful picture of Abraham's trusted servant, drawn in Gen. 24, no doubt the Eliezer of Gen. 15: 2, whom Abraham for want of a son had appointed as his heir.

The rights of the class of servants are more exactly defined by the *law*: and a distinction is made between those servants who were Israelites by birth, and the slaves obtained by purchase or as a booty from other nations. These regulations rest on a *twofold principle*:

1) That bondage, in a strict sense, all *human* servitude was for Israel completely done away with (Lev. 25: 42, 55; 26: 13). With reference, however, to the whole profane mass of the Gentiles, slavery is recognized as allowable (Lev. 25: 44-46).

2) The Israelites, since they themselves were at one

time slaves and strangers in Egypt, are to treat servants and strangers in a humane way (Ex. 22: 21; Deut. 15: 12–15; etc.).

[Analysis: 1) The O. T. in advance regards slavery as wrong; 2) it is, however, presupposed; 3) Eliezer; 4) the regulations in the law rest on a twofold principle.]

§ 110. The Regulations Concerning Hebrew Servants.

An Israelite might in a legal way become a slave, either by selling himself on account of poverty (Lev. 25; 39, 47), or by being sold by judicial decree on account of inability to make compensation for a theft committed (Ex. 22: 3).

There are two different ordinances in the Pentateuch concerning the way in which an Israelite who had fallen into slavery was to be treated,—the one in Ex. 21: 1–11, and Deut. 15: 12–18; and the other in Lev. 25: 39–55.

The apparent contradiction between the two laws is to be solved (with J. D. Michaelis, Hengstenberg, and others), by supposing that during the first forty-four years of a period of jubilee, the emancipation of servants was entirely regulated by the laws in Ex. 21: 1–11 and Deut. 15: 12–18; while, on the contrary, the year of jubilee brought freedom to those who fell in servitude in the last years of the period of jubilee, even if they had not served for six years.

[Analysis: An Israelite legally might become a slave in two ways; 2) there are two different ordinances given; 3) solution of the apparent contradiction.]

§ 111. The Position of Servants not Israelites.

By circumcision slaves obtained a right to partake of the Passover (Ex. 12: 44); they were thus, in distinction from aliens and day-laborers (Ex. 12: 45), to be treated as members of the family. It is not lawful

to interfere with the Sabbath rest of the slaves (Deut. 5: 14). The master had no right over the *life* of the slave (Ex. 21; 12, 20, 21). The humane treatment of slaves required by the law is also inculcated elsewhere in the Old Testament (Job. 31: 13–15). The admonitions not to treat a slave too delicately (Prov. 29: 19, 21) are to be regarded as a parallel with those touching the training of children.¹

[**Analysis:** 1) Slaves, not Israelites, might obtain a right to partake of the Passover; 2) their treatment; 3) their number in Solomon's time.]

¹ In time there arose in the Hebrew state a sort of helot class, mentioned especially in the time of David (2 Chron. 2: 17; 2 Sam. 20: 24) and Solomon (1 Kings 9: 20, 21; 2 Chron. 8: 7, 8). This class, which was bound to compulsory labor and employed on the public works, is estimated in 2 Chron. 2: 17, at 153,600 persons.

SECTION V.

THE MOSAIC PUBLIC WORSHIP.

§ 112. General Introductory Remarks. Essential Character of this Worship.

Although the whole life of the Israelite must be shaped as a service paid to God, yet there exists a special series of institutions, in which special expression is given to the fundamental idea of the theocracy,—that Israel must consecrate to God, itself and all that it has. These institutions of public worship, however, must not be looked at in their bare outward form, but must be referred to the idea of the covenant, and interpreted from it—for the aim of the covenant is sanctification—and the whole task of the ritual worship is the representation and exercise of the process of sanctification.

In the Mosaic ritual the acts of worship were not merely signs of internal things, which would go on in relative independence of the acts of worship,—*e. g.* sacrifice does not symbolize a devotion to God taking place independently of the act of sacrifice; it is not merely a symbol, but it is just the devotion of oneself to God which is carried out in the act of sacrifice. The sacrifice is itself an embodied prayer; to it is attached the attainment of divine pardon and blessing. That the sacrificial side of worship is predominant in the Old Testament, and the sacramental in the New, is due to the relation of Law to Gospel; in the latter, what God does for man stands first; in the former, man's acts.

For the stage of infancy, the ritual ordinance has the educational value of a process working from the outside to the inside, and so awakening a God-fearing disposition, a consciousness of inward communion with God (Deut. 14: 22, 23).

[Analysis: 1) The fundamental idea of the theocracy is consecration to God; 2) the aim of the covenant is sanctification; 3) sacrifice is itself an embodied prayer; 4) distinction between the sacrificial and the sacramental in worship; 5) the educational value of the Mosaic ritual.]

§ 113. The Place of the Word in Public Worship. The Oath.

The proclamation of the divine Word does not appear as an essential part of the Old Testament worship; and though the teaching of Jehovah's law and statutes is specified among the priest's duties (Deut. 33: 10), the reading of the law appears in connection with worship only every seventh year, at the Feast of Tabernacles (Deut. 31: 10, 11). But to the place of worship was attached, without express teaching, the knowledge of the God who shows Himself there as a present God (Ex. 29: 43-46); while with the acts of worship was connected a lively transmission of the knowledge of the great deeds on which Israel rested its faith (Ex. 12: 26, 27; etc.). Nevertheless, side by side with the established forms of worship there prevailed among the people a powerful spirit of prayer; and all the examples of prayer in the Pentateuch are represented as praying men of strong faith.

The oath is regarded as a religious act (Deut. 6: 13). Swearing is accordingly an act of religious profession (Jer. 4: 2), and is a distinct appeal to the penal justice of Jehovah against him who knowingly speaks falsehood (Josh. 22: 22, 23). The oath appears in private life from the most ancient times as a

promissory oath (Gen. 24: 2, 3); in particular, as an oath of covenant (Gen. 21: 23-25). The law still further acknowledges the assertory oath as an oath of purgation before the court of justice (Ex. 22: 11). The form in which an oath was taken was always that the oath was sworn by Jehovah.

Perjury, as a profanation of Jehovah's name (Lev. 19: 12), as a vain use of it (Ex. 20: 7), is a heavy sin.

[Analysis: 1) Preaching not an essential part of O. T. worship; 2) the reading of the law took place every seventh year; 3) God manifested Himself as a present God; 4) they were continually reminded of their wonderful history; 5) prayer; 6) the oath was a religious act; 7) its use in private life; 8) its form; 9) perjury.]

CHAPTER XVIII.

THE PLACE OF WORSHIP.

§ 114. The Requisites for a Place of Worship.

Since the persons charged with the conduct of the Mosaic worship have already been treated of, we have in particular only to treat of three other points: 1) of the seat of worship; 2) of the acts of worship; and 3) of the times of worship.

The simplest place of worship is the altar, which is first mentioned in Gen. 8: 20; a height rising toward heaven, signifying the ascent of the devotion embodied in sacrifice. The first condition for a place of worship is, that it has been chosen and sanctified by God, and has actually been witnessed to as the place of His revelation (Ex. 20: 24; Deut. 12: 5, 11).

The sanctuary is to be *one* only, that the people may be kept together in theocratic unity. The exclusive unity of the national sanctuary is implied, not only in Deuteronomy, but in what is said in the book of Exodus concerning the tabernacle as Jehovah's dwelling-place (Ex. 20: 24–26). The twelfth chapter of Deuteronomy, however, indicates that even during the wandering in the wilderness, the prohibition of other places of worship was not fully carried into effect.

[Analysis: 1) We must still discuss three points; 2) the first condition for a place of worship; 3) there was to be only one place; 4) this not always carried into effect.]

§ 115. The Arrangement of the Mosaic Sanctuary.

The Mosaic sanctuary was a tent, generally called the tent of meeting, *i. e. of God with the people* (Ex. 29: 42, 43). The other name for the sanctuary, tent (tabernacle) of the testimony (Num. 1: 50, 53; etc.), denotes the sanctuary as the place of revelation. In Ex. 26: 1-37, we have the description of how the tabernacle was built, in which we may notice 1) the ten curtains (*vv.* 1-6); 2) the external coverings (*vv.* 7-14); 3) the wood work used (*vv.* 15-30); 4) the veil and hanging (*vv.* 31-37).

The whole tent, 30 cubits long, and 10 wide, was divided into two rooms: in front, the Holy Place, twenty cubits long; and behind this the Most Holy Place, ten cubits square, separated from the former by a curtain woven with pictures of cherubim, called the veil (separation) (Ex. 26: 31-33).

The utensils of the sanctuary were as follows: In the court, in the open air before the sanctuary, stood the altar for burnt-offerings (Ex. 27: 1-8). At the four corners of the altar were heights, called horns, on which a part of the blood was smeared at the sin-offerings, and which were laid hold of by those who sought refuge at the altar (1 Kings 1: 50). Between the altar and the sanctuary was a copper washing-basin, in which the priests washed their hands and feet before going to the duties of the office (Ex. 30: 17-21).

In the sanctuary itself, toward the north, stood the table with the twelve loaves of shewbread (Ex. 25: 23-30). Opposite the table stood a golden candlestick with seven lamps (Ex. 25: 31-40). In the middle, before the curtain leading into the Most Holy Place, was the altar of incense.

In the Most Holy Place stood the ark of the covenant, the most sacred vessel of the sanctuary, containing the tables of the law, and covered with a golden plate called *kapporeth* (literally, *an instrument of atonement*, English Version, *mercy seat*), the most important part of the ark of the Covenant (Lev. 16: 13–16). Above the *kapporeth* stood two golden cherubim, with outspread wings and faces turned toward each other; between them the shekhina of Jehovah was supposed to be (Ex. 25: 22; Num. 7: 89). Besides this a vessel with manna (Ex. 16: 33), Aaron's rod that budded (Num. 17: 10), and lastly, by the side of the ark of the covenant, the book of the law (Deut. 31: 26), were kept in the Most Holy Place.

[Analysis: 1) Two names given to the tabernacle; 2) description of the building of the tabernacle; 3) arrangement of rooms; 4) utensils in the court; 5) in the Holy Place; 6) in the Most Holy Place.]

§ 116. Meaning of the Sanctuary. Its Three Rooms.

The tabernacle has three divisions. Into the first division, the court, only the covenant people can go; into the second, only the priesthood; into the third, the high priest alone, and that only once a year. The first division is under the open sky; the second is veiled, but still lighted; the third is quite veiled and dark.

In the sanctuary is embodied the idea of God's dwelling among the people of Israel. Here the people come to Jehovah in His dwelling-place. Into the first division, the court, only the covenant people can go, and not into the sanctuary itself, which is only allowed to be entered by the priests (the mediators of the people). But even these priests are not in a position (on account of their sinfulness) to establish a full

communion with God. For this reason Jehovah's dwelling-place is divided into two apartments: the veiled, holiest of all, in which Jehovah, the revealed, and yet hidden and in a manner unapproachable God is enthroned in the darkness; and the holy place the place of the priests and their service, which on this account is the symbol of the mediation of the covenant.

The statement that the model of the tabernacle and its vessels was shown to Moses on the Mount (Ex. 25: 9, 40; Heb. 8: 5), does not in itself imply that the sanctuary was to be a literal copy of a celestial original, but only that it served to give expression to the ideas of revelation. There is, moreover, a contrast between the two divine dwelling places; for in heaven God dwells in His majesty as Ruler of the world,—in the earthly tabernacle He dwells in His condescending grace.

[Analysis; 1) The three divisions of the tabernacle; 2) the meaning of the sanctuary; 3) contrast between the earthly and the heavenly tabernacle.]

§ 117. Meaning of the Sacred Vessels in the Court and in the Sanctuary.

The meaning of the various sacred vessels corresponds to the meaning of the three divisions of the sanctuary. The only piece of sacred furniture with reference to which an immediate activity of the people takes place, the altar of burnt-offering, stands in the court. The *horns* of the altar are 1) either symbols of the divine power of salvation and help (so Keil) or 2) in these horns the general meaning of the altar (that worship ascends to God) *culminates*, so that thus the blood of atonement sprinkled on them is, as it were, brought a step nearer God (Oehler). The *wash-*

ing-basin marks the passing from the general offering of sacrifice to the specific priestly service. He who has to carry on the service of reconciliation for the congregation must sanctify his own walk and acts.

In the *holy place* stands *the altar of incense*. The incense-offering, presented here every morning and evening by the hand of the priest, was a symbol of the prayers of the people (Ps. 141: 2; Rev. 5: 8; 8: 3).

Oehler thinks that by the table with the shewbread is meant, that the people in its twelve tribes testifies by the continual presentation of nourishing bread in the sanctuary, that it owes to the blessing of its God the maintenance of life, and that thereby Israel dedicates to God the exercise of the calling by which it wins its daily bread in the use of God's gifts. This interpretation is carried further by Hengstenberg and others, who make the shewbread a symbol of spiritual nourishment. The *candlestick* with its *seven-fold* light points to the *perfect Light* which shines in this covenant community; and in particular, the light does not refer merely to the communication of higher knowledge, but to saving divine grace in general. This meaning of the symbol is specially confirmed by the visions of Zechariah (4: 1-14).

In the symbols, then, of the *Holy Place*, the truth is expressed, that the people presents itself before its God in the light and life which it receives in virtue of covenant communion with God.

[Analysis: 1) Significance of the horns of the altar; 2) of the washing-basin; 3) of the altar of incense; 4) of the table of shewbread; 5) of the candlestick; 6) general significance of the symbols in the Holy Place.]

§ 118. The Meaning of the Ark of the Covenant, with the Kapporeth and the Tables of the Law.

In the Most Holy Place, the ark of the covenant is the symbol and vehicle of the presence of the revelation of Jehovah among His people. Hence it is called the throne of God (Jer. 3: 16, 17); God's footstool (1 Chron. 28: 2; Ps. 99: 5). But its meaning is more nearly defined by the three parts—the kapporeth (mercy seat) on the ark, the tables of the law in it, and the cherubim over it.

1) The kapporeth is the most important part of the ark of the covenant (Ex. 25: 22). In the fact that it is the *instrument of atonement*, and that it is at the kapporeth that the highest act of atonement is executed, is expressed 1) that the God who dwells in the midst of His people can only commune with them in virtue of an atonement offered to Him, and 2) that He is also a God who can be reconciled. This throne of God is veiled in deep darkness (1 Kings 8: 12), and the manifestation of God over the kapporeth takes place in a cloud, which veils His glory (Lev. 16: 2). On the day of atonement, the high-priest when he approaches with the blood of atonement must envelop himself in a cloud of incense, when he raises the curtain (Lev. 16: 13). This expresses the fact that full communion between God and man is not to be realized, even through the medium of the atonement to be attained by the Old Testament sacrificial institutions—that, as is said in Heb. 9: 8, as yet the way to the (heavenly) sanctuary was not made manifest.

2) The kapporeth rests on the ark, in which are the tables of the law, the testimony. This means that God sits enthroned in Israel on the ground of the

covenant of law which He has made with Israel. The testimony is preserved in the ark as a treasure, a jewel. And while the law is 1) a testimony to the will of God *toward* the people, it is also 2) a testimony *against* the sinful people,—a continual record of accusation, so to speak, against their sins in the sight of the Holy God. And now, when the *kapporeth* is over the tables, it is declared that God's grace, which provides an atonement or covering for the iniquity of the people, stands above His penal justice.

[Analysis: 1) The symbolic meaning of the ark of the covenant; 2) names given to it; 3) the three parts to be considered; 4) meaning of *Kapporeth*; 5) the two ideas expressed by it; 6) manner of God's manifestation; 7) mode of the high-priest's approach; 8) symbolic meaning of this; 9) of the fact that the *Kapporeth* covers the ten commandments; 10) the two-fold testimony of the law.]

§ 119. The Cherubim.

The cherubim are one of the most important symbols of the Mosaic worship, occurring no less than eighty-five times in the Old Testament. They nowhere appear developed into independent personality, like the *malakhim* (angels); they are not sent out like these, but are constantly confined to the manifestation of the Divine Being. In Ezekiel, where their form is the most complicated (compare Rev. 4: 6–11), they appear with a four-fold face, that of a man, a lion, a bull, and an eagle,—with four wings, their whole body covered with eyes (Ezek. 10: 10–15). In Ezek. 1: 5 they are called living creatures, as in Rev. 4: 6. This description of Ezekiel's is not to be transferred to the cherubim of the temple. The passages in the Pentateuch lead, as Riehm and Keil rightly assert, to nothing further than to winged human forms.

Our inquiry into the meaning of the cherubim must start from the fact that they designate a place as the abode of the habitation of God (Paradise, the taber-

nacle, and later the temple), and are thus the bearers of the manifestation of God when He manifests Himself to the world in His glory; on which account they are called God's chariot (1 Chron. 28: 18; Ps. 18: 10). Since they bar the entrance to Paradise (Gen. 3: 24), and protect and shade the ark (Ex. 25: 20), the first element in their function is to express to man's consciousness the inaccessibility of the Divine Being. They reflect the glory of the unapproachable God in a form which is accessible for human eyes, but at the same time so constructed that they could give no support to the worship of images. By uniting in itself the noblest earthly living creatures (man, the eagle, the lion, the bull), the symbol is evidently meant more particularly to set forth the divine glory as it is manifested in the world. It is the cherubim which at the same time proclaim and veil the presence of God. The continual mobility of the living creatures (Rev. 4: 8) signifies the never-resting quickness of the divine operations; this is probably symbolized also by the wheels which are given to the cherubim in Ezekiel (1: 16). The number *four*, connected with the cherubim in the latter form of the symbol, is the signature of all-sidedness (towards the four quarters of heaven). Thus Jehovah, when He is honored as the One who is enthroned above the cherubim, is acknowledged as the God who rules the world on all sides, in power, wisdom, and omniscience.

The philological explanation of the term is altogether uncertain.

[Analysis: 1) The cherubim are not personal beings; 2) are not sent out like angels; 3) in Ezekiel they have a complicated form; 4) this description not to be transferred to the cherubim of the sanctuary; 5) method of getting at a true view; 6) they express the inaccessibility of God; 7) they set forth the divine glory as manifested in the world; 8) they both proclaim and veil the presence of God; 9) significance of the mobility of the living creatures; 10) why four-fold face.]

CHAPTER XIX.

THE ACTIONS OF MOSAIC WORSHIP.

§ 120. On the Idea of Offerings in General.

The action of worship falls under the general notion of *offerings*. The essential nature of an offering in general is the devotion of man expressed in an outward act. The inward impulse which impels man to praise, thank and supplicate God finds expression, indeed, in words of devotion; but this impulse is not fully satisfied till this word is, as it were, embodied in a corresponding action, in which man deprives and denies himself of something and thus by deeds testifies the earnestness of his devotion to God.

An essential factor in the offering is a *substitution*, which can take place in a two-fold way,—1) when the person who brings the offering is represented by the gift substituted in his place; and 3) when something is substituted for the object to be offered (Ex. 13:13). The idea of substitution is brought out more fully when another life is offered in the place of the life of the person who offers.

[**Analysis:** 1) The essential nature of an offering; 2) the inward impulse and the outward embodiment; 3) the essential thing is substitution; 4) which can take place in a two-fold way; 5) the highest form of substitution.]

§ 121. Pre-Mosaic Sacrifice and the Mosaic Covenant Sacrifice as the Basis of Mosaic Sacrificial Worship.

Sacrifice was not newly introduced by the Mosaic law. Genesis not only speaks of sacrifice as observed by the patriarchs, but, in Gen. 4, carries back the pre-

senting of offerings to the earliest stage of mankind. As has been shown above (see § 20, 21), the pre-Mosaic offerings had the signification of thank-offerings and offerings of supplication, though a propitiatory element is connected with the burnt-offering (first mentioned Gen. 8: 20), lying in the "sweet savour" (literally, *odor of satisfaction*), through which the sacrifice had an appeasing effect (Gen. 8: 21). Although offerings for atonement, in the strict sense, are not mentioned in the Old Testament before the introduction of the Mosaic sacrificial law, still we may say that in Gen. 8: 21 we have a first elementary and symbolic expression of the necessity of an atonement before God. It has been a long disputed question, whether the origin of sacrifice is to be traced back to a positive divine demand, or to human invention and caprice. Oehler holds that in this way of putting the question, the alternative is not correctly formulated—because man offers in virtue of his inalienable divine image, which makes it impossible for him to abstain from seeking that communion with God for which he was created, by such active self-devotion as takes place in offerings.

Gen. 22 is important for the development of the Old Testament idea of offering. In it is expressed 1) the divine sanction of sacrifice in general as the proof of man's believing devotion to God; 2) the declaration that such devotion is to be proved by readiness to part with even the dearest possession out of obedience to God; 3) human sacrifice is banished out of the region of the religion of revelation; 4) the acceptance of an animal victim as the substitute of man is ordained.

The foundation of the whole system of Mosaic offerings is formed by the covenant-offering in Ex. 24,

especially in virtue of the meaning which here for the first time (apart from the institution of the Passover) attaches to the blood of the sacrifice. The covenant is to subsist on offerings, for the people are not to approach their God with empty hands (Ex. 23: 15; Deut. 16: 16, 17). In order, however, to make such an approach possible to the sinful people, God institutes an ordinance of atonement, which runs through all the acts of worship, and by the use which is from this time forward made of the blood of the sacrifice at the burnt- and thank-offerings, the idea is expressed that man may never approach God without previous atonement,—that this must be accomplished before he can expect that his gift will be favorably received by God.

In describing the regulations concerning offerings, we treat 1) of the material of the offerings; 2) of the ritual of sacrifice; and 3) of the various kinds of offerings with reference to their purpose.

[Analysis: 1) Signification of Pre-Mosaic offerings; 2) the meaning of Gen. 8: 20; 21; 3) the origin of sacrifice; 4) four lessons drawn from Gen. 22; 5) the significance of the covenant-offering in Ex. 24; 6) the significance of the blood; 7) method of discussion.]

§ 122. Bloody and Bloodless Offerings.

According to their material, offerings are partly bloody and partly bloodless. Bloody offerings are exclusively animal-offerings. Human sacrifice was excluded from the legitimate worship of God (Gen. 22: 11, 12; Ex. 13: 13; Deut. 12: 31).

Offerings of animals are most important, chiefly on account of the significance attaching to the blood. For the most part the food-offerings and the drink-offerings which went along with them, were connected with animal-offerings.

[Analysis: 1) Bloody sacrifices; 2) human sacrifice was excluded; 3) why animal-offerings so important.]

§123. The Material of Animal Offerings.

In reference to the materials of animal-offerings, it is laid down as law:

1) That they must be taken from among the clean animals (Lev. 27: 9, 11). The law for distinguishing between clean and unclean animals is given in Lev. 11 and Deut. 14. On what ground does this distinction rest? It seems that the principle was laid down that all flesh-eating animals were necessarily to be accounted unclean, because to partake of blood is an abomination. So, too, the birds enumerated as unclean are partly birds of prey, and partly such as feed on worms and the like. To these are added all animals that had anything repulsive and hideous. For the larger animals any other ground than that given in Lev. 11: 4—6 could hardly have existed.

2) Of clean animals, those were fit for offering which formed the proper stock of domesticated animals,—cattle, sheep, and goats. Of fowl, turtle-doves and young pigeons were offered. The animals of sacrifice were to be without blemish, free from bodily imperfections (Lev. 22: 21—24). With respect to the age of the animals offered, the law commanded that they should at least be eight days old (Lev. 22: 27: Ex. 22: 29, 30). Animals, however, were also to be presented in the vigor of youth.

[Analysis: 1) The law for distinguishing between clean and unclean animals; 2) the reason of this distinction; 3) animals fit for offering; 4) to be without blemish; 5) age.]

§ 124. The Ingredients of the Vegetable Offerings. Salt in the Offerings.

The ingredients of the vegetable-offerings, and particularly of the Minhha, or food-offering, were according to Lev. 2, as follows: 1) Ears roasted by fire

(Lev. 2: 14); 2) Flour (Lev. 2: 1),—to both of these olive oil and frankincense were added (Lev. 2: 1, 15, 16); 3) Unleavened loaves or cakes, prepared from fine flour, of three sorts (Lev. 2: 4–8). Thus the food-offering was made of that which served as the common nourishment of man, and at the same time was produced by human toil. Nothing but wine was used for the drink-offering which went with the food-offering.

Two kinds of fermentation are forbidden, 1) with leaven; and 2) with honey (Lev. 2: 11); probably because the process of fermentation was looked on as akin to corruption.

Salt was essential to every meat-offering (Lev. 2: 13). In virtue of its power of seasoning and preventing putrefaction, salt is the symbol of cleansing and purification as well as durability.

[Analysis: 1) Different kinds of vegetable offerings; 2) principles underlying these offerings; 3) fermentation forbidden; 4) signification of the use of salt.]

§ 125. The Principle on which the Material of Offerings was fixed.

The principal views are as follows:

1) A first view holds that these rules were fixed with an eye to the people's property (Bähr). But this view is far too extensive to explain the material of offerings.

2) A second view holds that the determining principle is that of nourishment. Offerings are frequently called the bread of God (Lev. 21: 6; 22: 25; etc.), not as of food offered for God's nourishment, but only of a giving to God of the people's nourishment. The people bring an offering to God of the food which they have produced in the vocation ordained for

them of God; and thus they sanctify their calling, and bring a testimony of the blessing which God has given on the labor of their hands (Deut. 16: 17).

3) This last conception favors that point of view which Kurtz has asserted with good reason (which only must not, as Kurtz formerly did, be taken as the actual principle of choice),—the psychico-biotic relation in which the offerer stands to the gift presented. The feature of self-denial essential to a real offering is particularly prominent in these gifts, which are taken from the best and most precious part of man's produce,—for it is especially an act of self-denial to give the first-fruits of the herd and of the field, to which the heart is wont to cling particularly.

What is the meaning to be attached to the oil and the incense which accompany the food-offering? No doubt the offering of the incense is the symbol of prayer ascending to God, and well-pleasing in His sight (Ps. 141: 2), and the incense along with the Minhha is to serve to imprint more definitely on the offering the character of a vehicle of prayer. It is disputed, however, whether the oil, like the incense and the salt is simply a supplement to the Minhha (Kurtz),—namely an unction indicating (because the oil is a symbol of the communication of the Spirit) that only such labor is well-pleasing to God as is consecrated by the Divine Spirit, and that only those gifts should be brought to Him which are produced by such toil,—or, whether the oil in the offering is co-ordinate with the grain and the wine, and thus an independent constituent of the gift (Bähr).

[Analysis: 1) The first view as to the principle on which the material of offering was fixed; 2) the second view; 3) Kurtz's view; 4) the feature of self-denial made prominent; 5) the meaning of the incense; 6) of the oil.]

§ 126. The Ritual of Animal Sacrifice.

The parts that make up the action of offering, and first of animal sacrifice, are in general—1) The presentation of the animal to be sacrificed before the altar; 2) the laying on of hands; 3) Killing; 4) Sprinkling of blood; 5) Burning on the altar.

1) The consecration of the offerer, accomplished by avoiding all Levitical defilement, and by washing, preceded the sacrificial festival (1 Sam. 16: 5). After this the offerer had in person to bring the animal selected to the entrance of the tabernacle (Lev. 1: 3; 4: 4) where stood the altar of burnt sacrifice (Ex. 40: 6).

2) Then the offerer (if there was more than one, one after another, Ex. 29: 10) laid, or more correctly pressed firmly, his hand on the head of the sacrificial animal (Lev. 1: 4; 3: 2; 4: 4, etc). The offerer, by the laying on of his hand, appoints the animal to be for him a medium and vehicle of atonement, thanks, or supplication, according to the designation of the offering with which at the time he now wishes to appear before God.

3) The slaughtering of the beast of sacrifice follows immediately on the laying on of hands, and, as the law presupposes throughout, is executed at private offerings by the offerer himself. At those sacrifices, however, which formed the standing service at the offerings for the cleansing of lepers (Lev. 14: 13, 25), as well as the sacrifices offered for the whole nation (2 Chron. 29: 22, 24), the slaughtering was the business of the priests, who were probably assisted by the Levites (2 Chron. 29: 34).

The place of slaughtering was on the north side of the altar (Lev. 1: 11; etc.), probably because it was

dark, and therefore cheerless. The law makes no regulations for the manner of slaughtering; tradition, however, is all the more explicit on this account, and makes it aim mainly at the speediest and most complete way of obtaining the blood.

[Analysis: 1) Five points to be considered; 2) the consecration; 3) the laying on of hands; 4) the slaughtering; 5) the place of slaughtering; 6) the manner.]

§ 127. The Use made of the Shed Blood.

4) The streaming blood of the slaughtered animal was immediately caught in a basin by a priest, and was stirred incessantly to prevent it from clotting. The manipulation of the blood which followed differed according to the various kinds of offering, that is, according to the degree in which the element of atonement was connected with the sacrifice. The lowest grade (in the burnt-offerings, Lev. 1: 5, trespass-offerings, Lev. 7: 2, and thank-offerings, Lev. 3: 13) consisted in sprinkling, or rather swinging, the blood around the altar. On the contrary, at the sin-offerings higher grades of the manipulation of blood took place, consisting in bringing the blood to specially sanctified places, according to the dignity of the sin-offering. In the first or lower grade of sin-offering, part of the blood was put on the horns of the altar of burnt-offering (Lev. 4: 30, 34); in the second, the blood was brought into the holy place, and part of it was sprinkled or spurted (Lev. 4: 6, 17) seven times toward the inner veil and put on the horns of the altar of incense. In both cases the remaining quantity of blood was to be poured at the foot of the altar of burnt-offerings. In the highest grade of sin-offering, the blood was brought into the Holy of Holies, and the kapporeth (mercy-seat) was sprinkled with it (Lev. 16: 14-16).

The meaning of this use of the blood is given in Lev. 17: 11, where the prohibition to use blood is based on the following declaration: "For the life (soul) of the flesh is in the blood: and I have given it to you upon the altar to make atonement for your souls: for it is the blood that maketh atonement by reason of (in virtue of) the life (soul)." The passage means, that in the still fresh blood of the sacrifice which is put on the altar, the soul of the animal is presented for the soul of man, to atone for, more exactly, to cover, the latter. The Hebrew words (*Kipper, Kopher, Kippurim*) used to express the idea of atonement, denote expiation as a *covering*; the guilt is to be covered—withdrawn, so to speak, from the gaze of Him who is to be reconciled by the atonement, so that the guilty one can now approach Him without danger (Ex. 30: 12; Num. 16: 46). In the language of sacrifice, the priest, as the mediator between God and the people, is in general designated *as he who covers, or expiates, or makes atonement* (Lev. 10: 17; 15: 15, 30). That by which a trespass is to be covered can only be something by which He against whom man has offended is satisfied. Thus *kopher* passes over into the meaning of *lutron, ransom*, the payment which buys a debtor free (Ex. 21: 30; Num. 35: 31).

Now in what sense is the soul of the animal presented in the blood to serve in the sacrifice as a covering for the soul of man? Generally speaking, by man's placing the soul of the pure, innocent sacrificial animal between himself and God, because he is unable to approach God immediately on account of his sinfulness and impurity. For the congregation of Israel the approach to God is made possible by the fact that God gives to it in the Mosaic ritual the means of covering sin which is well-pleasing to Him, the Holy

One. God has put the soul of the clean and guiltless animal, which is presented to Him in the blood of the offering, in the *place* of the impure and sinful soul of the offerer, and this pure soul, coming between the offerer and the Holy God, lets Him see at His altar a pure life, through which the impure life of the offerer is covered; and in the same way this pure element serves to cover the pollutions clinging to the sanctuary and to do away with them. This is the Old Testament type for the passage in Heb. 9: 14, "Who through the eternal Spirit offered Himself without blemish unto God." The blood of sacrifice has thus a quite specific meaning. It is that which alone makes God's acceptance of all gifts possible, since in it the self-sacrifice of the offerer is vicariously accomplished.

[Analysis: 1) The use of the blood in the lowest grade of offerings; 2) in the first grade of sin-offering; 3) in the second grade; 4) in the highest grade of sin-offering; 5) meaning of Lev. 17: 11; 6) of the Hebrew words used; 7) in what sense is the soul of the animal a covering for the soul of man? 8) the O. T. type for Heb. 9: 14; 9) the self-sacrifice of the offerer is vicariously accomplished.]

§ 128. The Burning of the Offering.

5) When the manipulation of the blood was completed, the burning of the offering followed. In the burnt-offering, all the flesh and the fat pieces were consumed after the parts had been washed which required cleansing (Lev. 1: 7-9); in the other offerings, only the fat pieces. The burning of the offering completes the surrender of it on the part of the offerer, and for him the gift is destroyed, but only in such a way that at the same time the acceptance of the gift on the part of God ensues—an odor, which is well-pleasing to God. Being produced as the smoke and vapor of the burnt-offering, the real

essence of the offering rises upward, so that He is thus made to enjoy the offering. This is what is meant by the regularly recurring formula, "an offering made by fire, of a sweet savour unto the Lord" (Lev. 1: 9, 13, 17). But the fire which consumes the offering is originally one coming from God, because God thereby appropriates the offering (Lev. 9: 24). It must never go out on the altar, but must be continually nourished by the burnt-offering and the fat of the peace-offering, in order to preserve the identity of the fire on the altar with the original heavenly fire, and to represent at the same time the unbroken course of the adoration of Jehovah carried on in sacrifice. This heaven-born fire is the symbol of the divine holiness which reveals itself in Israel. That God accepts every offered gift only by means of the element which proceeds directly from Him is intended to teach that every sacrifice which man makes to God is made perfect only by being taken up into the purifying, sanctifying element of divine life (compare Mark 9: 49). The latter, indeed, becomes a consuming fire, for those who approach the Holy One in a profane spirit (Lev. 10: 2; Isa. 33: 14).

[Analysis: 1) The burning of the burnt-offering; 2) its significance; 3) an odor well-pleasing to God; 4) the fire is one coming from God; 5) must never go out; 6) symbolical meaning of fire; 7) may become a consuming fire.]

§ 129. The Ritual of the Food-Offering.

At those food-offerings which accompanied the burnt-offerings presented for the congregation, it is probable (there is no certain command) that the whole quantity of flour, oil, and incense was burnt on the altar. At the free-will food-offerings the offerer brought the material to the priest, who took a handful of the flour and the oil, together with the whole of

the incense, and burned it on the altar (Lev. 2: 1–3). The food-offerings accompanying peace-offerings will be treated of along with these. The law makes no provision concerning the manner of procedure in the drink-offering.

[Analysis: 1) The ritual of food-offerings accompanying burnt-offerings; 2) free-will food-offerings; 3) the drink-offering.]

§ 130. Various Kinds of Offerings with Reference to their Purpose.

The law of offering distinguishes, with reference to their design, four kinds of offerings,—burnt-, peace-, sin-, and trespass-offerings.

By this grouping we are led to refer the four kinds of offerings to two principal classes, those which assume that the covenant relation is on the whole undisturbed (burnt- and peace-offerings), and those that are meant to remove a disturbance and to restore the right relation to God. The latter are offerings of atonement, and comprehend both sin- and trespass-offerings.

[Analysis: 1) Four kinds of offerings; 2) may be referred to two classes.]

§ 131. The Burnt-Offering.

The ordinary name of the burnt-offering ('ola) means "that which rises upward to God in the fire" (so Bähr, Keil, Delitzsch, and Dillmann). The animal sacrificed must in accordance with the high rank of the offering, be a male without blemish, taken from among the most perfect of the beasts of sacrifice (cattle, sheep, or goats) (Lev. 1: 1–13). After the skin had been taken off (which was the perquisite of the priest, Lev. 7: 8), and the offal removed, the animal was *wholly* burnt on the altar, and the blood was sprinkled round it.

In this offering, the people and the individual expressed in a general way their adoration of Jehovah and their devotion to Him. In virtue of the presentation of blood connected with it, and as a fire-offering of pleasant odor, it is also propitiatory (appeasing) in general; it serves to make him who offers it acceptable before Jehovah,—indeed in virtue of this acceptableness, it serves as a covering or atonement for the offerer (Lev. 1: 4; 14: 20; 16: 24). This burnt-offering was the *morning* and *evening sacrifice* presented daily in the name of the people (the embodiment of morning and evening prayer), for which a yearling lamb was also used. This is called the continual burnt-offering. The time for presenting the offering was also the hour of prayer (Dan. 9: 21; Acts 3: 1), as, generally speaking, it is likely that an act of prayer was combined with the burnt-offering (compare 2 Chron. 29: 27–30).

The Sabbath, the New Moon, and the feasts were marked by an increased burnt-offering (Num. 8: 9, 11, etc.).

[Analysis: 1) The meaning of 'ola; 2) the animal must be a male without blemish; 3) wholly burnt; 4) the people expressed thus their adoration and devotion; 5) it was also propitiatory; 6) the morning and evening prayer; 7) the continual burnt-offering; 8) offered at the hour of prayer; 9) increased burnt-offerings at the feasts.]

§ 132. The Peace-Offering. Its Name, Nature, and Division.

The name of this sacrifice (*shelamim*) may be explained in a two-fold manner.

1) Some take it as derived from the Kal *shalem*, *to be entire*. This makes the name of the sacrifice declare that the offerer is in a relation of integrity, a relation of peace and friendship with God.

2) Others take it as derived from the Piel *shillem*, *to compensate*. But if this derivation is adopted, we are not to limit the *shelamim* (peace-offering) to the specific notion of the *thank-offering*, for peace-offerings are offered not only for some benefit already obtained, but also for *one still desired*; in short, as a testimony that to God alone we are indebted for whatever we receive or hope to receive.

We are to distinguish *three* kinds of peace-offerings: 1) the thank- or praise-offering (Lev. 7: 12–15); 2) the vow (Lev. 7: 16); 3) the free-will offering (Lev. 7: 16).

The *thank-offering* was the highest among the peace-offerings, referring to a favor not already supplicated for, properly a grateful acknowledgment for Divine favors as undeserved as they were unexpected. The *vow* always refers to something distinctly prayed for. The *free-will offering* is every free gift for which there was no other occasion than the will of the offerer, whom his heart impelled to show his thankful sense of all the blessings which the goodness of God had bestowed on him.

[Analysis: 1) Meaning of *Shelamim*; 2) three kinds of peace-offerings; 3) the thank-offering; 4) the vow; 5) the free-will offering.]

§ 133. The Ritual of Peace-Offering.

In the peace-offering the whole animal was not placed upon the altar, but the fat alone was removed at the cutting up of the animal and afterward burnt (Lev. 3: 3–5, 9–11, 14–16). This fat consisted, in the case of oxen or goats, of four, in that of sheep, of five parts. The *reason* for burning these fatty portions on the altar was that they were regarded as the choice parts of the animal. After the removal of the fat, the offerer of the private peace-offering was to

bring with his own hand not only this, but also the wave-breast and the right shoulder (therefore a foreleg) to the priest as a heave-offering (Lev. 7: 29-34).

The *waving* consisted in the priest's laying the matter to be waved upon the hands of the offerer, placing his hands under those of the latter and moving them in a horizontal direction—backward and forward, according to the Talmud, and also toward the right and left, that is, towards the four quarters of the heavens, according to some later Rabbins. This waving took place almost exclusively in the case of such portions of sacrifice as were allotted to the priests as a gift from Jehovah. The swinging forward evidently denoted the presentation of the gift to God, while the moving it backward again indicated that God on His part returned the gift, and assigned it to the priest.

The *heaving* was a special ceremony, a moving upward and downward of portions of the sacrifice with reference to the God who rules in heaven and on earth. In some cases it was combined with the wave-offering, in others practised independently, and generally speaking, heaving and burning appear in combination.

After the separation of the wave-breast, the rest of the flesh was the portion of the offerers, to be used by them as a *sacrificial feast* in the sanctuary, in which all the members of their families and other guests might participate. Levitical cleanness was indispensable in all who ate of the sacrifices. In the case of the thank-offering, the flesh was to be consumed on the same day (Lev. 7: 15); in that of other sacrifices, on the second day at the farthest; if any remained till the third day, it was to be burned (Lev. 7: 16-18).

The *signification* of this sacrificial feast was that God condescended to be the guest of the offerer, receiving

the breast as His portion of honor, and then relinquishing it to His servant the priest. Thus the repast was a pledge of the blessed fellowship into which He would enter with His people among whom He dwelt. It was also to be a *love-feast*, at which, besides the members of the family, the Levites (Deut. 12: 18), and (as prescribed, Deut. 16: 11, in the case of the peace-offerings at Pentecost) the needy were to find refreshment.

[Analysis: 1) The reason the fat alone was burned; 2) the heave-offering; 3) the waving; 4) the heaving; 5) the sacrificial feast; 6) its significance.]

§ 134. Of Vows.

The idea of the vow extends much farther than those vowed sacrifices properly so called. Three sorts of vows are mentioned: 1) vows of devotion (*Neder*); 2) vows of destruction (*Hherem*); 3) vows of abstinence (*'Esar* or *'Issar*).

The positive vow of devotion first appears in the Old Testament in the case of Jacob (Gen. 28: 20-22); as a promise to erect a place of worship, and might extend to persons, even the person of the vower, to animals and to lands (the vow of Hannah, 1 Sam. 1: 11). For the law of redeeming a vow, see Lev. 27: 1-25.

Anything which had fallen under the curse could only be the subject of the *Hherem*. This word signifies "a being cut off," for to be subject to the *Hherem* is to have forfeited existence. The *Hherem* might be carried into execution either in consequence of a Divine command or of a special kind of vow. Nothing devoted could be redeemed (Lev. 27: 28, 29). Of course this vow might not be arbitrarily vowed, but only that which had incurred the judgment due to idolatry could be thus placed under the ban (as may be in-

ferred from Ex. 22: 19; Deut. 13: 16). Hence the vow of extermination must be regarded as a manifestation of zeal for Jehovah's honor.

Among vows of abstinence, the most usual was that of *fasting*, which except on the Day of Atonement (Lev. 16: 29; 23: 27), was quite voluntary, and therefore often appears as the expression of penitence (compare 1 Sam. 7: 6; Joel. 2: 12; etc.), or of mourning in general. It is characteristic of the moral spirit of Mosaism, that it strictly forbids all unnatural austerities, such as maiming and mutilating the limbs, branding, and the like (Lev. 19: 28; Deut. 14: 1, 2; etc.).

A vow was never regarded as specially meritorious (Deut. 23: 22). Of course, if a vow were once made, its performance was strictly insisted on, with certain exceptions (Num. 30: 3-8; Deut. 23: 21-23). Inconsiderate vows are expressly reprov'd (Prov. 20: 25; Eccl. 5: 4-7).

[Analysis: 1) Three kinds of vows; 2) the vow of devotion; 3) the Hherem; 4) the vow of abstinence; 5) vows were not specially encouraged.]

§ 135. Nazaritism.

The most important vow was that of Nazaritism. The name *Nazar* (to separate) denotes this vow as one of abstinence. The Nazarite, however, is *one who separates himself* with a purpose of *consecration to Jehovah*. The *law of Nazaritism* (Num. 6: 1-21) treats only of a *temporary* and evidently *a voluntary* assumption of this vow, and not of a *perpetual* Nazaritism like that of Samson, Samuel, and John the Baptist (the only Nazarites for life mentioned in the Scriptures). Strict obedience to three things was required: 1) total abstinence from wine or strong drink, even from all

that proceeds from the vine, down to the kernels and husks; 2) he was not allowed to cut his hair; 3) all contact with the dead was to be carefully avoided. For the rest, he was not commanded to withdraw from intercourse with his fellow-men, nor does the law of the Nazarite speak of an obligation to celibacy; for which reason the Roman Catholic view, which sees in Nazaritism a type of monachism, is irrelevant. The *usual* and at the same time *shortest duration* of this vow amounted, according to later enactment, to thirty days.

From Num. 6: 1-21 we learn that Nazaritism contemplated a consecration of the whole being. *The idea of the priestly life*, with its purity and remoteness from everything affected by death or corruption, its self-dedication to God, which sets aside even the nearest earthly ties, is the fundamental idea of Nazaritism. The hair of the Nazarite was a symbol of *strength and vitality* and denoted that his person was God's possession, and his strength dedicated to His service, while its growth formed a sacred ornament, like the diadem by which the high priest was recognized as consecrated to God. Thus the command to let the hair grow forms the positive side of the command to avoid all contact with a dead body. In the case of Samson, the hair was not merely the symbol but also the vehicle of that abundance of strength by which he was fitted to become the deliverer of his fellow-countrymen.

[Analysis: 1) The vow of Nazaritism; 2) difference between temporary and perpetual Nazaritism; 3) strict obedience in three things was required; 4) Nazaritism is not a type of monachism; 5) its fundamental idea; 6) the hair a symbol of strength and vitality.]

§ 136. The Theocratic Taxes.

The fundamental idea of the theocratic taxes was that the people and all their possessions, especially the Holy Land, belonged to the Lord. Four kinds of such theocratic taxes may be mentioned:

1) The (male) first-born, both of man and beast belonged to the Lord, of which the former were to be redeemed (Ex. 13: 11–13).

2) The first-fruits of all the produce of agriculture (Ex. 23: 19; etc.).

3) As the first-fruits represent the blessings to be received, the *tenth* was, properly speaking, the *fee* which the Israelite was to render to Jehovah, as the Lord of the soil, for the produce of the land. This *tenth* of the fruits, whether of field or tree (Lev. 27: 30–33), was assigned to the Levites (Num. 18: 21–25), as a compensation for their deprivation of an inheritance among the tribes. Of this tenth the Levites were to pay a tenth to the priests (Num. 18: 26).

4) The tax imposed for the service of the sanctuary, which according to Ex. 30: 12, 13, was half a shekel, was not a mere property-tax, but rather for personal atonement, or more strictly, a covering. The money thus raised was, according to Ex. 38: 25–27, applied to the building of the sanctuary. But this tax can not be considered as an annual one. In Neh. 10: 32, 33 we first meet with a yearly contribution of a third of a shekel for the service of the sanctuary, and that without reference to the Mosaic enactment. In the times of Christ the half shekel reappears as a general Jewish temple-tax (Matt. 17: 24).

[Analysis: 1) The meaning of the theocratic tax; 2) four kinds of theocratic taxes; 3) the support of the Levites; 4) the support of the priests; 5) the temple-tax.]

§ 137. The Difference between the Trespass-Offering and the Sin-Offering with respect to the End in View.

The third and fourth kinds of sacrifice, the sin-offering and the trespass-offering have the common end of abolishing all interruption of the covenant relation caused by some transgression. This transgression is mainly designated as one committed in *error*, *i. e.* in ignorance, unintentional (see with respect to sin-offering, Lev. 4: 2, 13, 22, 27; etc.; trespass-offering, Lev. 5: 15, 18). Still the expression “unwittingly or through error” includes more than mere inadvertence and extends to errors of infirmity, of rashness, we might say, of levity.

If we examine the three passages on the *trespass-offering* in which its import most clearly appears (Lev. 5: 14–19; 6: 1–7; Num. 5: 5–10), we find that the trespass-offering presupposes *an act of defrauding*, which, though chiefly an infraction of a neighbor’s rights and in the matter of property, is, also, according to the views of Mosaism, an *infraction of God’s rights* in respect to the law. Besides material reparation, increased by a fifth of the value, the transgressor had also to make satisfaction to God by means of the trespass-offering.

Satisfaction being thus rendered in the trespass-offering for *an act of defrauding* it served indeed at the same time as a covering or atonement for him who had committed the act of defrauding (Lev. 5: 18), so that, covered by this satisfaction, he might approach the Holy God. But to effect directly an atonement for a sinner’s soul and therefore the absolution from sin of the sinner’s person, was the office not of the trespass but of the *sin-offering*. Delitzsch expresses it in this wise: The fundamental idea of the sin-offering

is *expiation*, that of the trespass-offering *satisfaction*; in the former, the *evangelical* feature is prominent, in the latter, the *disciplinary*.

[Analysis: 1) The common aim of the sin-offering and the trespass-offering; 2) the trespass-offering presupposes an act of defrauding; 3) satisfaction is made by trespass offering; 4) absolution was given through the sin-offering; 5) distinction drawn by Delitzsch.]

§ 138. The Ritual of the Trespass-Offering.

There is a decided difference in the ritual between the trespass and the sin-offering corresponding to their different intentions. Only the male sheep, generally the full grown ram, the very animal not included among the sin-offering victims, was used for the *trespass-offering*. Another distinction was, that the victims in the case of the *trespass-offering* were always the same, and no substitute could be admitted, as in the sin-offering, on account of the poverty of the worshipper. This makes it clear that the chief object of the trespass-offering was not an expiation for the *person* as such, but a compensation for a strictly defined injury.

The proceedings at the bringing of the trespass-offering are laid down in Lev. 7: 1-7.

[Analysis: 1) Two main points of distinction between the trespass and the sin offering; 2) the object of the trespass-offering; 3) explanation of Lev. 7: 1-7.]

§ 139. The Ritual of the Sin-Offering.

Peculiar to the *sin-offering* are:

1) The difference of the victims, according to the theocratic position of him for whom they were sacrificed. The victim was a *young bullock* in sin-offerings of the highest grade (Lev. 16: 3; 4: 3; 4: 13; Ex. 29: 10, 14, 36); a *kid of the goats* for the people on the Day

of Atonement (Lev. 16: 5), and on the other yearly festivals, and at the New Moon (Num. 28: 15, 22, 30; etc.); a *goat* or a *female* lamb for an ordinary Israelite (Lev. 4: 28, 32; 5: 6); *turtledoves* and *young pigeons* for the very poor (Lev. 5; 7; 14: 22).

2) The *blood* was brought to more sacred places than was the case in other sacrifices, and in the three following degrees. *a*) In sin-offerings of goats, kids, or lambs, for individual Israelites (the high priest excepted), some of the blood was smeared on the horns of the altar, and the rest poured out at its base (Lev. 4: 25, 30, 34). *b*) In the sin-offerings of bullocks offered for the congregation or for the high priest (on other occasions than on the Day of Atonement), the blood was sprinkled seven times toward the inner veil, the horns of the altar of incense were smeared therewith and the rest was poured at the base of the altar of burnt-offering (Lev. 4: 5-7; 16-18). *c*) At the greatest of the sin-offerings, that on the Day of Atonement, the blood was taken into the Holy of Holies (see § 140).

3) The consumption in sin-offerings of the lower grade of the flesh of the sacrifice, which had come into close contact with God, and was therefore designated as most holy, by the priests in the fore-court of the sanctuary (Lev. 6: 26, 29).

The explanation of the ritual of the sin-offering must be connected with what has already been said on the nature of sacrificial atonement. To substitute for the impure soul of the sinner a pure soul, which, being offered to God, may cover the offerer, is the meaning of a bloody offering, and consequently the direct intention of the sin-offering (see § 127).

The significance of the several elements of the sin-offering is as follows: 1) The *laying on of the hand*, with

which was probably connected the confession of sin, is meant to express the intention of the offerer to sacrifice the life of the animal as a covering for his impure soul. 2) The sacrifice itself follows in the blood obtained by the slaughter, and then immediately applied to the holy place where God is present. This *bringing near of the blood* to God advances the sin-offerings of the higher grade, till it reaches its climax in the great annual Atonement, the blood of which attains the nearest approach, by being brought into the Holy of Holies. 3) The offering of the blood is followed by the *burning of the fatty portions*, for God commands that the fat also of the pure victim, whose blood He has accepted as a covering for the soul of the sinner, should be conveyed to Him by means of fire, and this gives it the significance of a propitiatory offering, the acceptance of which serves as a sanction to the preceding act of atonement. Only the fat, however, and not the whole animal, was presented on the altar, to give prominence to the idea that in this sacrifice the offering of a *gift* holds a secondary position in the act of expiation. 4) The eating of the flesh by the priests (in the case of sin-offerings of the lower grade, as well as of peace-offerings) involves, like the burning of the fat, an acceptance on the part of God, which serves to declare and confirm the fact that the sacrifice has actually attained its end of making an atonement.

[Analysis: 1) Three things peculiar to the sin-offering; 2) different victims might be offered; 3) the use of the shed blood; 4) the consumption of the flesh of the sacrifice; 5) the intention of the sin-offering; 6) the meaning of the laying on of the hand; 7) of the bringing near of the blood to God; 8) of the burning of the fatty portions; 9) of the eating of the flesh by the priests.]

§ 140. The Ritual of the Day of Atonement.

The supreme act of expiation was that which took place on the tenth day of the seventh month (*Tisri*), the annual *Day of Atonement*. To it refer the laws in Lev. 16, and in Num. 29: 7–11. On this day an atonement was effected, not merely for the people and the priesthood, but in connection therewith for the sanctuary also (Lev. 16: 16). This atonement related moreover to *all* the sins of the people,—and therefore to those also which had been already expiated by other acts, on the assumption that the atonement in the fore-court was insufficient.

With respect to the *nature* of the sins, the above passages seem to set no limit to the atonement, and the expiation of the Day of Atonement had reference to every kind of sin, and availed for the congregation as a whole (Lev. 16: 33).

The act of atonement to be effected is divided *into two acts*: 1) the atonement for the high priest and his house, and 2) for the congregation. The atonement for the high priest must take place first, because the mediator capable of effecting an atonement for the people of God must first be prepared.

The *ritual* of the day is given in Lev. 16. The High Priest wore the white linen garments on the day he entered the Holy of Holies, the seat of the divine Shekhina, for the same reason that they are attributed to the highest spirits who stand before the throne of God in heaven (Ezek. 10: 2; Dan. 10: 5; etc.), to symbolize the *highest degree of purity*.

Of the two kids which were the sin-offering for the congregation it is said: And the high priest “shall cast lots upon the two goats; one lot for the Lord, and the other lot for Azazel” (Lev. 16: 8). With re-

gard to this word *Azazel*, we are not to regard it as a designation of the goat, but rather as the *name of the evil spirit* whose abode is in the wilderness, and who is thus designated as the one who is sent away. The word itself *may* be taken as an abstract name in the sense of "dismissal." We are scarcely justified, however, in regarding Azazel as Hengstenberg does, as simply equivalent to Satan, because the latter does not appear by name in the Pentateuch; still the idea of Azazel is at all events *akin* to the idea of Satan.

The ascending cloud of incense (Lev. 16: 13), symbolical of prayer ascending to God, was to interpose as a protection between the high priest and the presence, albeit concealed, of God.

By his entrance into the Holy of Holies with the blood of the bullock (Lev. 16: 14), the High Priest made atonement for himself, and was thus prepared for making it for the congregation. The first and single sprinkling must be referred to the personal purification of the High Priest and the priesthood (so also Kurtz and Keil), the second and seven-fold to the purification of the sanctuary, which had been polluted by the sinful atmosphere of the priests.

The High Priest now returned to the court, slew the goat destined for the Lord, brought its blood also into the Holy of Holies, and performed the same sprinklings as before. This concluded the acts of atonement made in the *Holy of Holies*.

Next followed the atonement made in the *Holy Place* (Lev. 16: 16), no doubt corresponding with the process within the Holy of Holies (compare Ex. 30: 10).

Lastly followed the atonement for the *altar of burnt-offering* (Lev. 16: 18).

The atonement for the priesthood, the sanctuary,

and the congregation, according to its three divisions, being thus completed, the other goat (Lev. 16: 20 compared with verse 10) on which the lot for Azazel fell, was brought before the altar of burnt-offering, and presented alive before the Lord, "to make atonement for (over) him" (Lev. 16: 10), which controverted words are probably explained "to cover him" (the goat), viz. by the application of the blood of the slaughtered goat. The proceedings at the purification of the recovered *leper* (Lev. 14: 6), and of the infected house (Lev. 14: 51) elucidate this point. Here two birds were taken; the one was killed and the other, after being dipped in the blood of the first, was let loose into the open field. So, in the case under consideration, by the application of the blood of the first goat to the second, it was declared, that only in virtue of the atonement effected by the blood of the first goat are the people in condition to send away their sins as forgiven to Azazel. The act of sending away the goat is described in Lev. 16: 21, 22. Thus were the sins upon the goat to be, as it were, banished to a place removed from all contact with the people.

For a description of what took place after the goat was sent into the wilderness, see Lev. 16: 23-28.

[Analysis: 1) The day of atonement; 2) this atonement referred to all the sins of the people; 3) the act of atonement is divided into two acts; 4) the reason the atonement for the high priest must take place first; 5) the reason the high priest wore white linen garments; 6) the meaning of Azazel; 7) the incense; 8) the two-fold sprinkling with the blood of the bullock; 9) the sprinkling with the blood of the goat; 10) the atonement of the Holy Place; 11) of the altar of burnt-offering; 12) the ritual in connection with the sending forth of the other goat; 13) an account of Lev. 16: 23-28.]

§ 141. Signification of the Ritual of the Day of Atonement.

The greatest prominence must be given in this ritual to that element in the ritual by which an atonement for sin is effected, and to that portion of the sacrificial transaction which specially subserves this end.

Wherein lies the efficacy of the expiation made on the Day of Atonement by means of the blood of the victim? In the fact that on this occasion the blood was brought as near to God as possible, before His throne, and indeed within the veil, into that central seat of His abode at other times unapproachable, thus making satisfaction for the people in the very place where the accusing law within the ark testified against them. The people, knowing themselves to be accepted with favor through the atoning blood, were assured of the continued dwelling of God in their midst and therewith of the continuance of their state of grace.

By the *laying on of hands*, according to Lev. 1: 4, is denoted the consecration of the animal to be the medium of atonement for the sins of the person sacrificing. There was a substitutionary transference (as shown by the analogy of Num. 8: 10, 11) of the obligation to do or suffer in his stead, that which God demanded from the offerer on account of his sin; and through this transference the blood of the animal, in which is its soul, became the medium of expiation for the soul of the person sacrificing.

The *slaughtering* could only express the completion of the act, or the endurance of the punishment, in order that the animal, or rather its blood, in which was its soul, might thereby become fitted to be a medium of expiation.

Although Oehler concedes that the idea of *vicarious punishment* (*poena vicaria*) is not foreign to the ritual of the Old Testament, he nevertheless denies that the animal sacrificed *vicariously suffers the penalty of death*. On this much controverted point the writer entirely differs from Oehler. With Kurtz, Hengstenberg, Kliefoth, Wangemann, Thomasius, and Philippi, we accept the *juridical interpretation* of the Old Testament sacrifice in which the slaughtering is regarded as a *vicarious punishment* endured by the sacrificial animal in the place of the person offering it. According to this view the *imposition of hands* may be defined as the consecration to a *vicarious, penal death*; the *slaughtering*, as the completion of this penal death, by which the blood of the animal was fitted to become the medium of expiation; and the *sprinkling of the blood*, the completion of the expiation itself. Delitzsch, who does not fully accept the so-called juridical view, so ably presented by Kurtz, nevertheless says that it is "not only the most simple and intelligible, but also the idea which harmonizes best with the New Testament antitype."

The meaning of the confession of sin made over the second goat (Lev. 16: 21) can only be that of a declaration, that past sins being forgiven, are now done away with,—are dismissed and relegated to the evil spirit, whose realm is situated beyond all connection with the abode of the holy people. It is also an error to see in the second goat an offering to Azazel. Mosaism acknowledges no evil power, independent of God, whose favor must be in some way secured. The point is not to propitiate, but to get rid of Azazel,—to declare to him that the nation, now that it has obtained forgiveness of sin, has nothing to do with him, the patron of evil.

As the day of atonement formed the climax of what the Mosaic ritual was able to effect with respect both to extent and degree of atonement, it closes the enactments concerning expiation, and may from this point of view be denominated its Supreme Solemnity. Without the Day of Atonement there would be an actual gap in the theocratic ordinances. The law, which was continually exposing the opposition in which the chosen people stood to the holy God through their sinfulness, could not be without an institution to show the way in which this opposition might be reconciled by an atonement for the congregation, and also relatively to secure such reconciliation; while at the same time, being weak through the flesh, it pointed beyond itself to that perfect atonement whose result will be the restoration of a truly sanctified people (Zech. 3: 8-10; Heb. 9: 6-8).¹

[**Analysis:** 1) The efficacy of the expiation lies in the fact that the blood was brought as near to God as possible; 2) the meaning of the laying on of hands; 3) of the slaughtering; 4) the animal sacrificed vicariously suffers the penalty of death; 5) the juridical interpretation the true one; 6) the meaning of the confession of sin; 7) the second goat not an offering to Azazel; 8) the day of atonement formed the climax of the Mosaic ritual; 9) the deep necessity of the institution of the day of atonement; 10) the fact that there is no further reference in the O. T. to this institution does not invalidate the antiquity of this festival.]

§ 142. The Levitical Purifications.

The Israelite, as pertaining to the holy people, was to be *clean*; and therefore when he had, though unavoidably, incurred uncleanness, or come in contact with anything unclean, and so become *unclean*, he was

¹ When the silence of the books of the Old Testament is adduced as an objection to the antiquity of this festival, the doubtful nature of such an argument is evident from the fact, that we must then, to be consistent, postpone its origin till the third century before Christ; for the first intimation of this festival, apart from the probable allusion to it in Zech. 3: 9, is found in the book of the Son of Sirach (Ecclus. 50: 5), and in 3 Macc. 1: 11.

to restore his state of cleanness by a special act. The chief *means* of purification was running water, which is itself a symbol of life, and therefore called *living* water (Lev. 14: 5, 50; etc.). In uncleanness of the *lower* degree, the washing of the unclean person or thing and separation till sunset were sufficient (Lev. 11: 24, 25; etc.). In uncleanness of the *higher* degree, the separation lasted seven, or in some cases fourteen days (Lev. 14). In cases of uncleanness incurred through contact with a dead body, a certain *water of sprinkling* was applied, which is itself designated as a sin-offering (Num. 19: 9, 17). The manner of its preparation is given in Num. 19. *Red* was the color symbolizing life and vital energy; *scarlet* the color of splendor; the animal is a *female*, the sex that brings forth, properly representing life. *Cedar* as the most durable of woods symbolizing incorruption; while great purifying power was in ancient times always ascribed to hyssop (Lev. 19: 6). Thus the water of purification was an infusion, strengthened by elements which symbolized vital energy, incorruption, and purity.

[Analysis: 1) For an unclean Israelite the chief means of purification was living water; 2) uncleanness of the *lower* and of the *higher* degree; 3) when water of sprinkling was used; 4) the explanation of Num. 19.]

§ 143. Acts of Purification for Removing the Suspicion of Guilt.

Of an entirely different character were those acts of purification which related to the denial of suspected crimes, viz: *adultery and murder*.

First was the *jealousy-offering*, and the *drinking of the water of cursing*, treated of in Num. 5: 11–31. The water in this case acquired, through the Word and power of God, a supernatural power, which, though not to

be conceived of as magical, really produced, through its influence on the mind, pernicious effects upon the body of the guilty, but was harmless to the innocent.

Secondly, we have the purification of a community from the suspicion of blood-guiltiness when a slain man was found in the neighborhood, and the murderer could not be discovered (Deut. 21: 1—9). The blood shed was to be removed from the midst of the people, and this was effected by the symbolical infliction of capital punishment upon the heifer,—a case of *vicarious punishment*,—and thus satisfaction was made to Divine justice.

[Analysis: 1) The jealousy-offering; 2) the drinking of the water of cursing; 3) the ritual is given in Num. 5: 11—31; 4) the purification of a community when the person committing murder could not be found; 5) the ritual is given in Deut. 21: 1—9; 6) an example of vicarious punishment.]

CHAPTER XX.

THE SACRED SEASONS.

§ 144. The Survey of the Sacred Seasons.

The sanctification of the course of time in general was effected by the morning and evening sacrifice (see § 131). Besides this, however, certain sacred seasons were appointed: 1) The seventh day of the week, or *Sabbath*; 2) The *new moons*, of which the seventh was invested with a festal character, and bore the name of the Day of Trumpets; 3) The three *festival pilgrimages*, when the whole congregation assembled at the sanctuary, viz: *a*) The *Passover*, with which the annual cycle of festivals commenced in spring, celebrated on the evening of the 14th of the month Abib or Nisan, the first month of the Mosaic year (Ex. 12: 2); *b*) The *Feast of Weeks* (Pentecost), seven weeks later; *c*) The *Feast of the Tabernacles*, from the 15th day of the seventh month (Tisri) onward; 4) The seventh month Tisri, besides being distinguished by the festal character of its new moon, included also the *Day of Atonement*; 5) Every seventh year was also sacred as the *Sabbatical year*, and every seventh sabbatical year as the *Year of Jubilee*. The laws concerning sacred seasons in general are contained in Ex. 23: 10–17; Lev. 23 and 25, Num. 28 and 29, and Deut. 16.

[Analysis: 1) The daily sacrifices; 2) the sacred seasons; 3) the Sabbath; 4) the new moons; 5) the three festival pilgrimages; 6) the day of atonement; 7) the Sabbatical year; 8) the year of Jubilee; 9) where the laws concerning sacred seasons are recorded.]

§145. Reasons which Determine the Times of the Feasts.

The number *seven*, which from Gen. 2: 2, 3 onward is the sign of Divine perfection, forms the fundamental type for the regulation of the sacred seasons.¹ It directly determines the order of the *sabbatical* seasons, and also exerts an influence upon the order of feasts. But what made these feasts, feasts, and the Sabbaths, holy days, was not human choice, guided by the order of nature, but the enactments of the covenant God who on the one hand preserved by these festivals a lively remembrance of the great facts of His deliverance and guidance of His people (Ex. 13: 9; Lev. 23: 42, 43; etc.), and on the other admonished the people to follow their earthly vocation in an agricultural life, in constant dependence on the Giver of all the blessings of nature, and to regard these blessings as inalienably connected with the ordinances of the covenant.

[Analysis: 1) Significance of the number seven; 2) why these feasts were appointed; 3) the day of atonement.]

§ 146. The Celebration of the Holy Days.

On the celebration of the holy days, the following general remarks may be made:

1) Besides the sacrifices prescribed for every day, certain special public sacrifices, differing in character according to the several festivals also took place. The laws respecting these are found in Num. 28 and 29.

2) On the seven annual feast days² rest from labor was commanded as well as on the weekly Sabbath.

¹ No hint is given in the law why the Day of Atonement was to take place on the tenth day of the seventh month. Baehr and Kurtz suggest that the Day of Atonement is by the number ten designated as the most comprehensive and perfect of days.

² The first and seventh days of unleavened bread, the day of the Feast of weeks, the new moon Sabbath, the Day of Atonement, and the first and last days of the Feast of Tabernacles.

3) The *positive* element in the celebration of the *weekly Sabbaths* and the *sabbatical feast-days*, is contained in the regularly recurring formula "holy convocation" of Lev. 23 and Num. 28. This expression signifies that the people were to come to the sanctuary to worship (Ezek. 46: 3, 9). A *universal command*, however, to appear in the sanctuary only took place with regard to the three festal pilgrimages, and then was given only to the male population (Ex. 23: 14, 17; Deut. 16: 16).

4) They who came to the feast were not to appear before the Lord *empty* (Deut. 16: 16, 17).

[Analysis: 1) The laws for special public sacrifices; 2) the seven annual feast days; 3) the celebration of the weekly Sabbath; 4) the people were to bring free-will offerings.]

§ 147. Antiquity and Origin of the Sabbath.¹

We must draw a distinction between the origin and antiquity of the Sabbath and the legal observance of it as a Mosaic institution. The blessing of this day and the hallowing of it is connected with creation (Gen. 2: 3). In the period before the deluge we have traces of the hebdomadal division of time (Gen. 4: 3; 8: 10, 12). We also find references to the weekly cycle in patriarchal times (Gen. 29: 27, 28). The week of seven days, and along with it the presumption that the sabbath was observed, is very ancient, and was known to the Babylonians, even before Abraham's time. This division of days into weeks is best explained by the original institution of the Sabbath in Paradise, and the weekly rest is universal, permanent, and independent of the Mosaic law. The obligation to set apart one day in seven for the service of God is a part of the original law of nature.

¹ Oehler maintains that the Sabbath is of purely Mosaic origin,

This command was repeated in the Decalogue and in the Mosaic law, with specific ceremonial characteristics adapting it to the Jewish nation.

The first injunction concerning the Sabbath appears in Ex. 16: 5, 22-30, on the occasion of the gathering of the manna, and in a form which seems to indicate that the Sabbath was then known to the people. The expression used in Ex. 20: 8, "*Remember,*" is, however, not intended to recall the Sabbath to the mind as an ancient institution, but requires the people to be from that time onward mindful of the Sabbath-day (in Deut. 5: 12 the word *observe* occurs). Neh. 9: 14 also testifies to the Mosaic origin of the ceremonial Sabbath. The Mosaic Sabbath is, moreover, peculiar in its independence of the changes of the moon, and in its significance, as an institution consecrated to Jehovah, and resting upon the covenant relation of Israel to Jehovah.

[Analysis: 1) The Sabbath was instituted in Paradise; 2) we have traces of the week in the antediluvian age; 3) also in the time of the patriarchs; 4) the week was also known to the early Babylonians; 5) the obligation to keep one day out of seven holy is a universal law; 6) the Mosaic law covering the Sabbath is ceremonial.]

§ 148. The Idea of the Sabbath.

In conformity with what has already been advanced, the *meaning* of the Sabbath is to be known from the Old Testament alone. The chief passages relating to it are Gen. 2: 3; Ex. 20: 8-11; 31: 12-17. We learn: 1) That man, like God, is to work and to rest; this human life is to be a copy of Divine life: 2) As Divine labor terminates in happy rest, so, too, human labor is not to run on in resultless circles, but to terminate in a happy harmony of existence. The idea of the Sabbath, however, extends further.

The whole course of human history is not to run on in dreary endlessness, but its events are to have a positive termination,—are to find a completion in harmonious and God-given order. The Divine rest of the seventh day of creation, which has no evening, hovers over the world's progress, that it may at last absorb it into itself. It is upon the very fact that the *rest of God* is also to be a *rest for man*, and that God has declared this by the institution of the Sabbath, that the Apostle in Heb. 4 founds a proof for the proposition, “there remaineth therefore a Sabbath rest for the people of God” (Heb. 4: 9).

The full purport, however, of the idea of the Sabbath is not attained until the dominion of *sin and death*, which has entered into the development of mankind, is taken into account.

[Analysis: 1) The chief passages relating to the Sabbath; 2) the two great lessons taught by the Sabbath; 3) the final rest for the people of God.]

§ 149. The Celebration of the Sabbath.

The Sabbath is, therefore, a Divine institution, or, to speak more correctly, a gift of Divine grace, for the sanctification of the people (Ezek. 20: 12). In other words, the Sabbath is first of all of a *sacramental* nature. To the divine gift, the conduct or devotion of the people which God requires must correspond, and thus a *sacrificial* is added to the sacramental element. In the Old Testament, the Sabbath, so far from presenting any painful aspect of renunciation, is regarded as a delight (Isa. 58: 13), *a day of joy* (compare the song for the Sabbath, Ps. 92).

It is in this sense we must regard the enactments with respect to the *celebration* of the Sabbath. The first point is the resting from labor, to which belongs not merely the intermission of servile work, but also

the prohibition to kindle fires in their dwellings for the preparation of food (Ex. 16: 23; 35: 3). Capital punishment (Ex. 31: 14; 35: 2) by stoning (Num. 15: 35) was attached to the transgression of the enactments, as it was to that of all the fundamental laws of the theocracy. The *positive* celebration of the Sabbath arose from its appointment for worship. As it was possible for only a small portion of the people to visit the central sanctuary, meetings for hearing and meditating on the Divine Word may have taken place in very early times, but the first trace of such assemblies is found in 2 Kings 4: 23. Greater prominence is unmistakably given in the law to the negative than to the positive side of the Sabbath sanctification.

[**Analysis:** 1) The Sabbath is a gift of divine grace; 2) has a sacramental as well as a sacrificial element; 3) is a day of joy; 4) the negative aspect of the celebration of the Sabbath; 5) the positive celebration; 6) the laws concerning the Sabbath.]

§ 150. The New Moon Sabbath.

On the approach of the new moon, the Sanhedrim assembled at Jerusalem to receive from him who had seen *the first appearance of the moon's sickle*, the information which was then transmitted by signals throughout the country. The ordinary new moons were only subordinate festivals (Num. 28: 11-15), but the *seventh new moon*, that of the month Tisri in the autumn, on the contrary, was a Sabbatical day. Its proper name, the day of trumpet-sounding, seems to indicate that the use of trumpets in public worship took place with special solemnity on this day. According to Num. 10: 9, 10 this sounding of the trumpet reminded the people that God was thinking of them.

[**Analysis:** 1) The ordinary new moons; 2) the seventh new moon; 3) significance of the sounding of the trumpet.]

§ 151. The Sabbatical Year and the Year of Jubilee.

Four laws are given relating to the Sabbatical year:

1) The general command in Ex. 23: 10, 11. Care for the poor is the point of view under which the Sabbatical year is here chiefly regarded.

2) The more detailed law in Lev. 25: 1-7, which more precisely designates this ordinance as a rest of the land unto Jehovah. The point of view here taken is that the produce of the sabbatic year is to be the common property for man and beast.

3) An essentially new enactment is contained in the third law (Deut. 15: 1-11). The question here, again, is the special import of the sabbatical year to the poor. For in the seventh year every creditor was to release the loan he had lent to his neighbor.

4) The fourth law respecting the sabbath year (Deut. 31: 10-13) enjoins that at the Feast of Tabernacles in the year of release, the law shall be read in the public assembly of the people in the sanctuary. In this a significant hint is given as to how the seventh year just entered upon ought to be hallowed.

Seven such sabbatic years terminated with the year of Jubilee. The passage Lev. 25: 8-10, is most naturally understood as declaring that the year of Jubilee is to follow the seventh sabbatical year.

With regard to the celebration of the year of Jubilee, we notice first the feature it had in common with the sabbatical year, as a cessation from agricultural labor (Lev. 25: 11, 12). The feature peculiar to the year of Jubilee was the "proclaiming of liberty throughout the land" (Lev. 25: 10). In this year of liberty there took place, as it were, a new birth of the state, at which all such civil impediments as were op-

posed to the theocratic principles were abolished. One of these was the bondage of Israelitish citizens (Lev. 25: 39–42). At this time also the restoration of hereditary estates took place (Lev. 25: 23–28).

[Analysis: 1) The four laws respecting the Sabbatical year; 2) the year of Jubilee; 3) the celebration of the year of Jubilee.]

§ 152. Import and Practicability of the Institution of the Sabbatical Year and the Year of Jubilee.

Much has been said at different times, of the agricultural and political advantages of this institution. But of all this the law says not a word; it simply refers to the Divine blessing with which obedience was to be rewarded (Lev. 25: 21, 22). It is upon the thought that man, acknowledging in act God's higher right of property (Lev. 25: 23), should withhold his hand from cultivating the land, and place it wholly at the Lord's disposal for His blessing, that the whole ordinance is founded. Israel was thus taught that the earth, though made for man, was yet not made merely that he might possess himself of its increase, but that it might be holy to the Lord, and also partake of His blessed rest. The Sabbath year, therefore, typically points to the time when creation shall be delivered from the bondage of corruption (Rom. 8: 21).

The year of Jubilee, by which the Sabbatic cycle was completed, has, moreover, its own specific import in the idea of release, and of the reinstatement of the theocracy in its original and divinely appointed order, in which all were, as the servants of God, to be free, and each was to be assured of his earthly maintenance, by being restored to the enjoyment of the inheritance allotted to his family for this purpose.

In the prophecy, Isa. 61: 1–3, the year of Jubilee is

as the year of *restoration* regarded as typical of the times of the Messiah, in which the discords of the world's history are to be resolved into the harmony of the Divine life. And hence Christ designates Himself as the fulfiller of this prophecy (Luke 4: 21); while Heb. 4: 9, by calling the perfected Kingdom of God the *Sabbath* of the people of God, also refers to the type of the year of Jubilee.

Although there were great difficulties in observing the Sabbatical year, still the system was by no means impracticable, if the people were willing to sacrifice all selfish considerations to the Divine will. The omission of the ordinances, was, however, already contemplated in Lev. 26: 35, while how far they were really carried into practice in post-Mosaic times does not appear. It is evident from 2 Chron. 36: 21, where it is said that the land lay desolate during the captivity seventy years to make up for its Sabbath years, that the celebration of the Sabbatical year had been omitted during the last centuries before the captivity. *After the captivity*, the people, under the influence of Nehemiah, bound themselves to the observance of the Sabbatical year (Neh. 10: 31), which, being frequently mentioned by Josephus, must have been henceforth the general practice.

[Analysis: 1) The import of the Sabbatical year; 2) its lesson; 3) a type; 4) the import of the year of Jubilee; 5) the prophecy of Isa. 61: 1-3; 6) Christ the fulfiller of this prophecy; 7) the practicability of keeping the Sabbatical years; 8) kept after the captivity.]

§ 153. Enactments concerning the Passover.

The enactments relating to the Passover are found in Ex. 12: 1-28, 43-49; 13: 3-10; 23: 15; Lev. 23: 5-8; Num. 28: 16-25; Deut. 16: 1-8. In Ex. 12: 1-20 we have the entire law of the Passover, as deliv-

ered to Moses and Aaron before the fact with which this feast was to be connected had taken place,—a circumstance, the consideration of which will obviate many apparent difficulties.

During the whole of the festival nothing leavened might be eaten (Deut. 16: 3), and on the 14th of Abib or Nisan all leaven and leavened bread were cleared out of the house. In general the preparations for the repast took place on the 14th, and the repast itself, which formed the commencement of the feast of unleavened bread, on the 15th. The whole animal was eaten that same night, not a bone of it being broken, with unleavened loaves and bitter herbs. In remembrance of what occurred at the institution of the Passover, the head of the household related the history of the deliverance of Israel during that night. The Hallel was chanted during the repast by the assembled family (Ps. 113 and 114 after the second cup and before eating the lamb, and Ps. 115–118 before the fourth cup).

[Analysis: 1) The laws concerning the Passover; 2) the preparations for the repast; 3) manner of celebration; 4) the Hallel.]

§ 154. Significance of the Feast of the Passover.

The *significance* of the Feast of the Passover was, *generally speaking*, a historical one; it was celebrated in the remembrance of the deliverance of Israel from Egypt. In a certain aspect the feast was also the consecration of the *beginning of harvest* (Lev. 23: 11, 15). When we inquire into the *special import* of this feast, we must, first of all, decide whether *the Passover transaction proper is to be regarded in the light of a sacrifice*. We would answer the question in the affirmative, because the Passover is expressly exhibited in a sacrificial point of view in Ex. 12: 27 ("it is the sacrifice

of the Lord's Passover"), in Num. 9: 7, 13 ("to offer the oblation of the Lord in its appointed season"). So too it is said in 1 Cor. 5: 7, "For our Passover also hath been sacrificed, even Christ."

The next question is, under *what class of sacrifices* is the Passover to be comprised?

Hengstenberg maintains that it belongs to the class of *sin-offerings*. "The Passover is a sin-offering in the fullest and most especial sense." Oehler maintains that the fact that it is a *repast* places the Passover in the class of *peace-offerings*; and since there can be no peace-offering without an atonement, which is effected by the sprinkling of the blood, the Passover presupposes an act of expiation effected by the application of the blood of the paschal lamb. The application of the blood to the door-posts of the house, which formed the place of sacrifice at the first Passover, had the same significance as the atonement and purification of the sanctuary with the blood of the Day of Atonement (Lev. 16: 16). Covered and purified by this blood the house was secured against the destroying angel. The blood of atonement was the wall of partition between the people of God and the world.

The Passover repast bore throughout the character of a feast. The Israelite received at each Passover new strength for the year just commenced. The prohibition against breaking a bone of the paschal lamb, meant more than an injunction not to treat it like an ordinarily slaughtered animal,—it rather signified that those who were partakers of it were united in inseparable communion. Baehr rightly appeals in explanation to the analogous passage in 1 Cor. 10: 17.

[Analysis: 1) The significance of the Passover was historical; 2) it was also the consecration of the beginning of harvest; 3) the Passover must be regarded in the light of a sacrifice; 4) so regarded in 1 Cor. 5: 7; 5) must be regarded as a peace-offering; 6) preceded by an atonement; 7) the repast had the character of a feast; 8) a type of the Lord's Supper; 9) meaning of the fact that not a bone of the lamb should be broken.]

§ 155. The Feast of Weeks (Pentecost).

The Feast of Weeks (Pentecost) owes its name to the fact that it was to be celebrated seven weeks after the Passover (Lev. 23: 15-21). It was also known as the feast of harvest, or of first fruits. In the Pentateuch it has the significance of a harvest thanksgiving. A historical meaning was first given to this feast by the later Jews, who made it refer to the giving of the law upon Mount Sinai, which is said by the Jewish tradition to have taken place on the fiftieth day after the departure from Egypt, while Ex. 19: 1 states quite generally that it was in the third month.

The central point of the religious celebration of this festival of one day's duration, was the offering of the two loaves of first-fruits for the whole people. As the wave-sheaf at the Passover was a sign that harvest had begun, so were these wave loaves, a sign that the harvest was completed. With the offering of these loaves were combined large burnt, sin, and peace offerings (Lev. 23: 17, 18). The feast was enlivened by festal repasts, which were furnished by the free will offerings (Deut. 16: 10, 11).

[Analysis: 1) The names given to the Feast of Weeks; 2) its significance; 3) its historical meaning; 4) the central point of its religious celebration; 5) accompanying offerings.]

§ 156. The Feast of Tabernacles.

The *Feast of Tabernacles* was kept on the seventh month (Tisri), from the fifteenth day onward and

lasted seven days. To these was added an eighth, the *Atsereth* (probably *conclusion*), which undoubtedly had a reference to the close of the whole annual cycle of feasts. The historic import of the *Feast of Tabernacles* was to remind the people, by a seven days' dwelling in booths made of boughs, of the wandering of their fathers in the wilderness (Lev. 23: 42, 43). It was the greatest feast of rejoicing of the year, and provided with more numerous sacrifices than the others (Num. 29: 12-34). Very splendid ceremonies were subsequently added to it, especially the daily *libation of water*, probably with reference to Isa. 12: 3, and the *illumination* of the court on the first day of the feast,—customs to which perhaps the words of Christ, John 7: 37, 8: 12, may refer.

Thus the festal half of the Israelitish ecclesiastical year coincided with the season in which the annual bounties of nature were gathered; while during the wintry half of the year, on the contrary, the course of the Sabbaths and the new moons was, according to the Moasic ritual, uninterrupted by festivals. It was only later on, that the Feast of the Dedication in the ninth month, and the Feast of Purim in the twelfth, were observed.

[**Analysis:** 1) The time of the Feast; 2) its historic import; 3) ceremonies connected with Feast; 4) the festal half of the Jewish year.]

PART II.



PROPHETISM.

PART II.

PROPHETISM.

SECTION I.

THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE THEOCRACY FROM THE
DEATH OF JOSHUA TO THE CLOSE OF THE OLD TESTA-
MENT REVELATION.

CHAPTER I.

THE TIMES OF THE JUDGES.

§ 157. **Course of Events. Import of the Office of Judge.**

The history of the period of the Judges exhibits a constant alternation between the apostasy of the people and their consequent chastisement by the Divine power, on the one hand, and the return of the people to their God and the Divine deliverances therewith connected, on the other.

In times of oppression, when the children of Israel cried unto the Lord (Judg. 3: 9, 15; 4: 3; etc.), individual men—the *Judges*—arose, who aroused by the Spirit of Jehovah, turned back the hearts of the people to their God, revived in them the remembrance of God's dealing with them in past times, and then broke the hostile yoke under which they were suffering. The whole aim of the narrative, however, is not the glorification of these men as the heroes of the nation, but the design is rather to show that the help afforded was the result of an outpouring of the Divine Spirit; and that God, in effecting the deliverance of His people, made choice of the lowly and despised as His instruments. Very instructive in this respect is the history of Gideon, the most prominent among the earlier judges.

The office of *Judge* was neither permanent nor hereditary, but purely personal. Called to a prominent position by the necessities of the times, they acted with energy in the affairs of the individual tribes at the head of which they were placed, but exercised no abiding influence upon the nation, which, on the contrary, relapsed into its former course, when its burdens were lightened or the Judge was dead (Judg. 2: 16-19).

[Analysis: 1) General character of this period; 2) the Judges; 3) aim of the Book of the Judges; 4) the import of the office of Judge.]

§ 158. Religious Condition. Decline of the Theocratic Institutions.

Are we justified, in speaking of a *decline* of the theocratic institutions, and does the Book of Judges really presuppose a legislation and a history such as the Pentateuch and the Book of Joshua attest? (Great stress has always been laid upon this point by the opponents of the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch.) So far as *religious* institutions in particular are concerned, it must be observed that it is foreign to the entire purpose of the Book of Judges to enter into the subject, and consequently the inference that institutions not mentioned therein would not have existed, is utterly unjustified. This applies equally to the Book of Joshua, which confessedly presupposes the Pentateuch. There are, however, quite sufficient data in the Book of Judges to show that although during this period and down to Samuel the injunctions and ordinances of the law were for the most part neglected, the theocratic institutions, as they are said to have existed under Moses and Joshua, are nevertheless in all essential matters presupposed.

The main question is: Does the Book of Judges know of a central sanctuary as the only authorized place of sacrifice? or did several sanctuaries of Jehovah exist contemporaneously in the times of the Judges? We answer: The national sanctuary, the *tabernacle*, was during the times of the Judges permanently located at Shiloh (Josh. 18: 1; 19: 51; Judg. 18: 31; 1 Sam. 1; etc.). It was there that the annual festivals were solemnized (Judg. 21: 19; 1 Sam. 1:3), and the regular sacrificial worship was offered (1 Sam. 2: 12, 13). A second legitimate tabernacle in some other locality is not once spoken of. The whole narrative of 1 Sam. 4, according to which the carrying away of the ark was regarded as a terrible calamity, is deprived of all meaning unless the existence of but a single ark is assumed.

The fact that the Books of Judges and Samuel take but little notice of the individual *sacrificial laws* in the Pentateuch, is easily accounted for by the nature of the contents of these books.

It has also been claimed that the Book of Judges knows nothing of the calling of the tribe of Levi, as appointed in the Pentateuch. On the contrary, we regard it as a prominent and remarkable fact, that the Levites appear in the Book of Judges in exactly that position which Deuteronomy assumes, when it always classes them with the strangers on account of their poverty. Nor is it difficult to show why there were as yet no organized Levitical services. The services appointed to the Levites in the Pentateuch ceased with the wanderings of the tabernacle, and nothing was enacted in the law with respect to their further employment; while the period of the disintegration of the theocracy was one utterly unadapted for the production of new ordinances of worship.

[Analysis: 1) During the times of the Judges the ordinances of the law were largely neglected; 2) but the legislation of the Pentateuch was presupposed; 3) the Book of Judges knows of only one authorized place of sacrifice; 4) of only one ark; 5) the reason the historical books take but little notice of the sacrificial laws; 7) the position of the Levites in the Book of Judges.]

§ 159. Religious Syncretism of this Period.

The commixture with other religions was manifested in a two-fold manner during the age of the Judges. 1) By a blending of the worship of Jehovah with heathenism, on the part of those Israelites who had fallen into Canaanitish idolatry. 2) By the fact that even among those who adhered to the worship of Jehovah, the religious consciousness was more or less obscured by heathen ideas. Hence the image-worship of Micah and the Danites.

Here likewise the narrative concerning Jephthah belongs (Judges 11: 28–40). The opinion which prevailed in Jewish antiquity and among the Fathers of the Church, and which was also embraced by Luther, and many moderns, is that Jephthah really slew his daughter, and offered her as a burnt offering upon the altar. The view that Jephthah only consecrated his daughter to the service of the sanctuary in a state of life-long virginity, was first urged by certain mediaeval Rabbins (Kimchi, Ralbag, etc.), and has since been maintained by Hengstenberg, Cassel, Gerlach, Keil, and others, who refer to Ex. 38: 8 and 1 Sam. 2: 22, where women are mentioned as serving in the sanctuary. According to this view, the fulfillment of the vow would lie in the words of Judg. 11: 39, which must not be taken as pluperfect (“and she had not known man”), but as an account of what now took place (“and she knew no man”). Oehler grants that there are some things in the narrative favorable to

this view, but nevertheless rightly maintains that this interpretation is at variance with the plain meaning of the words, "who did with her according to his vow which he had vowed", which in their reference to Judg. 11: 31 cannot relate to a merely spiritual sacrifice. It cannot, however, be inferred from the narrative that human sacrifices were at this time legal in the worship of Jehovah, the matter being evidently represented as a horrible exception. The history shows that in those days, when the worship of Baal and Moloch was still contending for the mastery with the true service of Jehovah, the fear of the Holy One of Israel, might even in the heart of a servant of the Lord, be perverted to the shedding of human blood for the sake of keeping a rashly uttered vow.

(Analysis: 1) The commixture with false religions manifested in a two-fold manner; 2) the narrative concerning Jephthah; 3) the explanation of Luther; 4) of many moderns; 5) the literal explanation the best; 6) does not however countenance human sacrifice.]

CHAPTER II.

FOUNDATION OF THE MONARCHY.

§ 160. The Philistine Oppression. Samuel.

The appearance of Samuel, and the growth of Prophetism by his means, form the turning-point of the period of the Judges. The new state of affairs had been prepared for, partly by Philistine oppression, which was both a longer and a heavier judgment than any with which the people had yet been visited and partly by the judgeship of Eli.

The person of Samuel, moved as he was by the prophetic spirit, became the centre of the nation's life. The sanctuary at Shiloh being rejected, and the agency of the high-priesthood suspended, the mediatorship between God and His people rested with the prophet, who though not of the priestly race, but by descent a Levite of the region of Ephraim,¹ now performed sacrificial services in the presence of the people (1 Sam. 7: 9, 10). As the central sanctuary was no longer existing, we now find *various* places of sacrifice, as the high places of Ramah (1 Sam. 9: 13), Bethel and Gilgal (1 Sam. 10: 3; 11: 15; 15: 21). Thus were the bounds imposed by the Mosaic ritual for the first time broken through.

The day of penitence and prayer for which Samuel assembled the people at Mizpah, in the tribe of Benjamin, after he had put down idolatry, became, by the

¹ The fact that Samuel was devoted to the service of the sanctuary by a special vow, proves nothing against his Levitical descent, because without this vow such service was not binding on him till he should be twenty-five years of age.

help of Jehovah, who acknowledged the prayer of His prophet, a day of victory over their enemies, and the beginning of their deliverance (1 Sam. 7: 5—17). Samuel was henceforth Judge of the whole nation; and the prophetic office began from this time to develop its agency, on which account the history of propheticism, properly speaking, dates from Samuel (Acts. 3: 24).

[Analysis: 1) The history of Prophetism begins with Samuel; 2) the prophet became the centre of the nation's life; 3) various places of sacrifice; 4) Samuel was the last of the Judges.]

§ 161. Nature, Importance, and first Beginnings of the Prophetic Office.

In the discussion of the institution and duties of the prophetic office our point of departure must be the fundamental passage, Deut. 18: 9—22. The character of the prophetic, differed entirely from that of the priestly office. It was not, like the latter, confined to one tribe and one family, nor, generally speaking to an external institution, though a certain succession subsequently took place.

The prophet was to prove his divine mission, not so much by signs and wonders, for the performance of which even a false prophet might receive power, as by his confession of the God who redeemed Israel and gave them the law (Deut. 13: 1—5). Again, what the prophet spoke was to *come* to pass; that is, the prophetic word was to be corroborated by its historical fulfilment.

The prophetic office was designed 1) to prevent a mere lifeless transmission of legal injunctions, and 2) to cast a light on the future of the people, and to disclose to them the Divine counsels, whether for their warning or comfort.

The prophet is the man of the Spirit. By the Spirit

of Jehovah is the Divine word put into the mouth of the prophet, hence also his name *Nabhi*. The classical passage as to the meaning of the word *Nabhi* is Ex. 4: 14-16 taken in connection with Ex. 7: 1. The *Nabhi* is the *interpreter*, the one who speaks for another; who utters the words that another has put into his mouth. The gift of prophecy is that which institutes a direct personal intercourse between God and man; and prophecy thus becomes, through God's self-witness to the prophet, the type of the teaching of His people by God Himself under the new covenant (Jer. 31: 34; John 6: 45). The operation of the Divine Spirit, however, upon the prophet, was not merely intellectual, but one which renewed the whole man. The prophet became another man (1 Sam. 10: 6), and received another heart (1 Sam. 10: 9.)

The first beginnings of prophecy reach back to the times before Samuel. For Moses was himself a prophet (Deut 34: 19), and his sister Miriam is also called a prophetess (Ex. 15: 20; Num. 12: 2). But in the earlier times of the Judges, the gift of prophecy appeared but occasionally (Deborah, Judg. 4: 4, 6, 14; 1 Sam. 3: 27). There must also, as may be inferred from 1 Sam. 9: 9, have been from time to time *seers*, with whom counsel was taken in private affairs, but of whom a more extensive sphere of operation cannot be assumed.

It cannot be proved from Amos 2: 11 that the *schools of the prophets* existed before Samuel,—nor from the fact that Samuel was a Nazarite as well as a prophet, that prophecy being thus combined with Nazaritim, these schools of the prophets existed in the form of ascetic associations, into which many retired during these troublous times.

[Analysis: 1) Importance of the passage in Deut. 18: 9—22; 2) the prophetic office not limited to one family or tribe; 3) proof of the prophetic mission; 4) aim of the prophetic office; 5) meaning of the word **prophet**; 6) the gift of prophecy; 7) Moses was a prophet; 8) the schools of the prophets].

§ 162. The so-called Schools of the Prophets.

There is scarcely any subject of Old Testament history and theology which could formerly boast of having excited so large a share of interest and investigation as the so-called *schools of the prophets*, which made their appearance at only two periods of Israelitish history, viz., in the days of Samuel, and in the kingdom of the ten tribes in the times of Elijah and Elisha.

By this assembly of prophets around Samuel, we understand an association of prophets drawn together by the leading of the Spirit, and among whom the prophetic gift was cherished by sacred services performed in common. It cannot be legitimately inferred that the cultivation of vocal and instrumental music was the direct end of this association, as musicians are distinguished from prophets. Music was designed, on the one hand, to prepare the mind for the apprehension of the Divine voice (compare 2 Kings 3: 15); on the other, to be a vehicle for the utterance of the prophetic inspiration¹.

This prophetic office, after Samuel had founded the kingdom, and delivered up to the king the authority he had exercised as judge, may be defined as that of watchman to the theocracy. This office of watchman was to be exercised both toward the nation in general and toward the holders of theocratic offices in particular, especially the king. It was also their office to write the theocratic history.

¹ There is so close a connection between sacred song and prophecy, that the former is itself called prophesying (1 Chron. 25: 2, 3); and the chief singers appointed by David (1 Chron. 25: 1, 5; 2 Chron. 29: 30) are called prophets and seers.

[Analysis: 1) The schools of the prophets; 2) gathered around Samuel; 3) a close connection between music and prophecy; 4) the prophet was the watchman and historian of the time.]

§ 163. The Foundation of the Israelitish Kingdom. Consecration of the King.

The request of the people for a king, in the sense in which it was made to Samuel, was a denial of the sovereignty of Jehovah, a renunciation of their own glory as the theocratic people, and a misconception of the power and faithfulness of the covenant God. A faulty constitution, and not their own departure from God and His law, was regarded as the cause of their misfortunes. Their hope of a better future was therefore founded upon the institution of an earthly government, and not upon the return of the people to their God.

To make it evident that the Divine choice was entirely independent of earthly considerations, it was not a man of importance, but one as yet unknown, of the least family of the smallest of the tribes (1 Sam. 9: 21), who was raised to the throne.

The consecration to the kingship was effected according to ancient and recognized usage, by *anointing*, a rite performed by Samuel on Saul (1 Sam. 10: 1), and subsequently on David (1 Sam. 16: 3), and repeated in the case of the latter after his actual entrance upon the government (2 Sam. 2: 4; 5: 3), by the elders of the people.

Anointing was a symbol of endowment with the Divine Spirit (1 Sam. 10: 1, 9; 16: 13), the gift which is the condition of a wise, just, and powerful government,—all ability to rule righteously being but an outflow of Divine wisdom (Prov. 8: 15, 16).

[Analysis: 1) The sin of Israel in asking for a king; 2) they rested their hopes on an earthly government; 3) the divine choice; 4) the consecration of the king; 5) significance of the anointing.]

CHAPTER III.

PERIOD OF THE UNDIVIDED KINGDOM.

§ 164. Saul.

The history of Israel during the time of the undivided kingdom is separated by the reigns of its three Kings into three sections essentially differing in character.

The reign of Saul at once displays the *Kingdom in conflict with the theocratic principle* maintained by the prophets. The narrative in the First Book of Samuel, how Saul after being forsaken by God, advanced step by step to his tragical end, and the Books of Samuel in general, are the most complete portion of Old Testament history; while the vivid and graphic descriptions, and the sharpness and delicacy with which the chief characters are portrayed, are excellent even in an artistic point of view.

[Analysis: 1) The undivided kingdom; 2) character of the reign of Saul; 3) the graphic narrative of the Books of Samuel.]

§ 165. History of the Reign of David.

David had reigned seven and a half years in Hebron before he received the submission of all Israel in a form in which the theocratic principle was expressly recognized (2 Sam. 5: 2, 3). Thus began the powerful reign of David, whose kingship becomes the type of the kingdom of God which overcomes the world. Hence all the attributes of the latter are ascribed to him: he is destined to subdue the heathen (Ps. 18: 43-47); his dominion is to extend to the end of the

earth (Ps. 2: 8; 72: 8; etc.), and is of continual and eternal duration (2 Sam. 7: 16; 23: 5; etc.)

The *kingship*, as administered by David, appears neither as a necessary evil nor an improved constitution, but as a new ethical power. The king becomes also the representative of the people, and the idea of *Divine Sonship*, which in the first place appertains to the people, is transferred to him. Kingship in the person of David exhibits also a certain measure of the *priestly character*; for David appeared for the people before the Lord with sacrifices and intercessions, and brought back to them the Lord's blessing (2 Sam. 6: 18).¹

It is a peculiarity of David, like Moses and Samuel, that to a certain degree he unites in himself *three theocratic dignities*; for the gift of *prophecy* also was bestowed on him, the Spirit of God spoke by him, and the words of God were on his tongue (2 Sam. 23: 2).

In the history of revelation, the eternal covenant of God with David and his seed (Ps. 89: 20–37) now enters as a new element (2 Sam. 23: 5); the full manifestation of the kingdom of God being henceforth combined with the realization of the “sure mercies of David” (Isa. 55: 3); and thus upon the foundation of the theocratic notion of kingship arose the prophecy of its antitypical perfection in Messiah.

It is not, however, solely in virtue of his theocratic position, but also by reason of *his personal religious development*, that David is an important character in the history of the Old Testament. The contrast between sin and grace, which it is the object of the pedagogy of the law to bring to light, appeared in all its sharpness in his inner life; and his life of continual

This was done, however, without encroaching upon the special duties of the priesthood.

conflict brings to view, both the deep degradation of the fallen, sin-burdened man, and the elevation of a spirit richly endowed with divine grace. To a greater degree than any other Old Testament character, he experienced the restlessness and desolation of a soul burdened with the consciousness of guilt, the longing after reconciliation with God, the struggle after purity and renovation of heart, the joy of forgiven sin, the heroic, all conquering power of confidence in God, the ardent love of a gracious heart for God; and has given in his *Psalms* imperishable testimony as to what is the fruit of the law and what the fruit of faith in man.¹

It is impossible to rate too highly the treasure that Israel possessed in the *Psalms*, that copy-book of the saints, as Luther called them; nor can it be doubted that it was chiefly by means of the *Psalms* that the Word of God dwelt in the homes of Israel, and that the knowledge of the sacred history was kept up among the people.

[Analysis: 1) The reign of David is a type of the kingdom of God; 2) all the attributes of the latter are ascribed to him; 3) the idea of divine Sonship is transferred to him; 4) he exhibits also the priestly character; 5) like Moses and Samuel he unites in himself three theocratic dignities; 6) the eternal covenant of God now enters upon a new development; 7) his kingship a type of the kingship of the Messiah; 8) his personal religious development; 9) the lessons of David's life; 10) the *Psalms* the prayer-book of the Church of God.]

§ 166. The Form of Worship under David.

The building of the temple, which David was not permitted to undertake, was at all events prepared for by him,—for, unless Solomon on entering upon his government had found considerable treasures, he

¹ What a perversion of all Sacred History on the part of those Higher Critics who deny the Davidic composition of all the *Psalms*.

could not so quickly have commenced the work of building.

David displayed an active zeal for public worship, which manifested itself, in the first place, with respect to the organization of the priesthood. David regularly organized the *priestly service*, by dividing the priests into twenty-four classes, of which sixteen belonged to the line of Eleazar and eight to that of Ithamar (1 Chron. 24: 3-5). Each class had a president at its head, and had to officiate for a week, from Sabbath to Sabbath (2 Chron. 23: 4). The order of the classes was determined by lot (1 Chron. 24: 7-19).

David also organized the service of the *Levites*. Opportunity was afforded by the introduction of music into the public worship (2 Chron. 29: 25). By this service of song, by which words as well as acts were made prominent in public worship, the spirituality of the temple service was increased. Towards the close of his life, David with a view to the needs of the future temple, arranged a more complete organization of Levitical services, dividing the 38,000 Levites who were at that time thirty years old and upwards into *four classes* (1 Chron. 23: 3-5), three of whom had charge of the service of the sanctuary viz., 1) the servants of the priests (24,000); 2) singers and musicians (4,000); 3) door keepers (4,000); and to the fourth class (6,000), called officers and judges, was delivered the care of external affairs (1 Chron. 26: 29). The first class was subdivided into 24 courses corresponding with the 24 classes of priests; the class of singers and minstrels into 24 bands, each of which had a president and eleven masters of the same family at its head (1 Chron. 25: 6-31). The share of the congregation in the musical service of the sanctuary

seems to have been generally limited to saying "Amen" and "Hallelujah", and the like (1 Chron. 16: 36; Jer. 33: 11). It is self evident that the arrangements instituted by David could not be fully carried out till the completion of the temple by Solomon, as is indeed expressly stated in 2 Chron. 8: 14, 15.

[Analysis: 1) David made arrangements for the building of the temple; 2) organized the priestly service; 3) as well as the service of the Levites; 4) introduced a service of song; the Levites were organized into four classes; 6) a responsive service.]

§ 167. Solomon. The Building of the Temple.

Among Solomon's works, the temple offers special matter for consideration with respect to Biblical Theology. The description of the temple (1 Kings 6 and 7) is evidently derived from a document compiled by an eye-witness.¹ The proportions of the tabernacle were in all essential respects followed in the temple building, which was constructed of hewn stone. It was divided into *two parts*, of which the foremost was forty cubits long; the hindmost, the holy of holies, twenty cubits long and as many high and broad, thus forming a cube. Before the east side of the temple was a porch, the whole breadth of the temple, twenty cubits long and ten wide. The temple was surrounded on its three remaining sides by a secondary erection of three tiers of side chambers, designed for stores and treasures. The Holy of Holies in the temple as well as the tabernacle was quite dark (1 Kings 8: 12). The temple was next surrounded by two courts, raised one above the other like terraces (2 Kings 21: 5), of which the inner one was called the upper court, from its elevated position (Jer. 36: 10). The second court, the place of worship for the people, was probably separ-

¹ Remains of Solomon's temple are still to be seen in the gigantic blocks of masonry, often thirty or more feet long, found among the foundations on the temple site.

ated from the first by a railing, thus allowing the congregation to witness what was transacted in the court of the priests. Thus the separation of the people from the holy place was more strictly effected in the temple than in the tabernacle. The furniture and vessels of the temple corresponded on the whole with those of the tabernacle, except that they were of increased dimensions, and that some were found in the former which were absent from the latter. In the court of the priests, as in the court of the tabernacle, stood the altar of burnt-offering; in the place of the laver of purification was the so-called brazen sea; on each side of the court were five brazen lavers, for the purification of all that pertained to the altar of burnt-offering. In the Holy Place, the foremost part of the temple, as in the tabernacle, were the altar of incense, the table of shew-bread (according to 2 Chron. 4: 8, *ten* tables); while instead of the one candlestick of the tabernacle there were ten golden candlesticks, five on each side, before the Holy of Holies. In the *Holy of Holies* there were besides the ark, two cherubim ten cubits high, whose four wings, each four cubits long, spread out horizontally, touched each other in the midst over the ark, and reached on the right and left to the two walls of the Holy of Holies.

[Analysis. 1) Description of the temple; 2) modeled after the tabernacle; 3) the furniture and vessels of the temple; 4) in the outer court; 5) in the Holy Place; 6) in the Holy of Holies.]

§ 168. Significance and Dedication of the Temple.

The symbolic significance of the temple is entirely identical with that of the tabernacle. The meaning of the two colossal columns of brass, called *Jachin* and *Boaz* (1 Kings 7: 15–22), evidently is that God has here established His temple on a firm foundation, and that it is therefore to be no longer a traveling

sanctuary like the tabernacle (2 Sam. 7: 5-7). It is just because Jehovah no longer dwells in a moving tent, but in a settled house that the cherubim *stand* in the temple upon the floor of the Holy of Holies, and make the whole place the constant abode of the Divine presence. The reason for increasing the one candlestick and table of shew-bread of the tabernacle to the *ten* candlesticks and *ten* tables of Solomon's temple, is found in the greater extent of the latter, the number ten being also itself a completed unity.

After the temple was completed, Solomon had the ark brought into it, and the tabernacle taken down and deposited, together with its sacred utensils, in the temple, probably in the side chambers (1 Kings 8: 4), thus putting an end to the two-fold worship. The king himself then dedicated the temple by prayer and sacrifice in the seventh month, Tisri (1 Kings 8).

A sanctuary of permanent countenance seemed now to be erected; and Solomon expressed in his prayer the hope that this house might be a house of prayer for all nations (1 Kings 8: 41-43).

Concerning the *temple worship*, we further learn from 1 Kings 9: 25 that Solomon offered sacrifices three times a year, which refers probably to the pilgrimage feasts.

[Analysis: 1) Significance of the temple same as that of the tabernacle; 2) the meaning of the two pillars of brass; 3) change in the position of the cherubim; 4) why ten candlesticks; 5) the tabernacle was stored away in the temple; 6) dedication of temple; 7) Solomon's prayer; 8) the temple worship.]

§ 169. Hebrew Proverbial Poetry.

As the sacred lyric poetry of Israel is connected with the names of David, so Solomon, whose peaceful times invited the Israelitish mind to self-introspection, was the father of the Hebrew proverbial poetry

(1 Kings 4: 29–34), and thus the founder of the Old Testament *Hhokhma (Wisdom)*. From his time onward there appeared a special class of men under the name of *Hhakhamim*, “the wise,” (Prov. 1: 6; 22: 17; 24: 23; etc.), who applied themselves to the consideration of the moral relations of life and the manner in which the world is ordered. The province of the Old Testament Wisdom was different from that of the Law and of Prophecy—it did not extend to theocratic enactments and directions. A circle of sages, among whom the king was distinguished for the fertility and many-sidedness of his genius, and for his acuteness in solving enigmatical questions (1 Kings 10: 1), was probably formed at Solomon’s court. An association of *Hhakhamim*, employing themselves in the collection of literature, must, according to Prov. 25: 1, have also existed under Hezekiah (727–696 B. c.).

[Analysis: 1) Solomon was the father of proverbial poetry; 2) the wise men; 3) province of Old Testament Wisdom; 4) these sages also flourished in the time of Hezekiah.]

§ 170. Solomon’s External Organizations.

Solomon employed the long interval of peace in further carrying out the organization of the state, in rearing various edifices and fortifications, especially in Jerusalem itself (1 Kings 9: 15–19), and in the promotion of industry and commerce (1 Kings 8: 26–28; 10: 11, 22). This magnificent reign, however, had its dark side. The king’s love of splendor became more and more oppressive to the people, and he sank deeper into effeminacy and luxuries, till he at last allowed himself to be seduced by his heathen wives into an open breach with theocratic institutions, by erecting for their sakes (1 Kings 11: 4, 5) sanctuaries for strange gods in the immediate neighborhood of Jerusalem.

The prophetic order, however, which had, it seems, long remained in the background, now arose against the king, to avenge the insulting majesty of the law. After a warning had been given to Solomon (1 Kings 11: 11-13), Jeroboam, a high official of Solomon, received an intimation from the prophet Ahijah that ten tribes of Israel were to be severed from the house of David and to be united in a separate kingdom under his sceptre (1 Kings 11: 29-40).

After the death of Solomon, ten tribes renounced their allegiance to Rehoboam, and made Jeroboam their king. In vain did Rehoboam raise a considerable force from that part of the nation which remained faithful to him; a word from the prophet Shemaiah sufficed to disband his whole army (1 Kings 12: 22-24; 2 Chron. 11: 2-4).

The disruption of Israel was from this time irremediable. The separated kingdoms took hostile positions with respect to each other, and at last consumed their strength in sanguinary wars. The external glory of the kingdom was at an end; but prophecy never ceased to direct the expectation of the nation to the future reunion of the twelve tribes under one head of the house of David.

[**Analysis:** 1) The bright side of Solomon's reign; 2) its dark side; 3) the division of the kingdom threatened; 4) Jeroboam elected king by the ten tribes; 5) the dilemma of Rehoboam; 6) the relation of the two kingdoms to each other.]

CHAPTER IV.

THE KINGDOM OF THE TEN TRIBES.

§ 171. Preliminary Remarks.

The history of the Ten Tribes, or of the *kingdom of Israel*, comes chiefly under the consideration of Biblical Theology, as exhibiting the serious nature of *Divine retribution*. The history is full of conspiracies, regicides, and civil wars; it is a continuous testimony to the fact that when once the divinely appointed path is forsaken, sin is ever producing fresh sin, and that the punishment of one crime is inflicted by another.

Nine dynasties, including nineteen kings, succeeded each other in the 250 years during which the kingdom existed (975–721 B. C.), and only two of these dynasties, those of Omri and Jehu, possessed the throne for any length of time.

[Analysis: 1) The general character of the history of the northern kingdom; 2) its lessons; 3) its dynasties.]

§ 172. Jeroboam I. to Omri (976–930 B. C.).

The first measure taken by Jeroboam was to make the political separation of the tribes a religious schism. He erected two separate sanctuaries, one in the south, at Bethel, and the other in the north at Dan, where image worship had already existed in the time of the Judges (Judg. 18). One main obstacle to the image-worship (1 Kings 12: 28) was formed by the Levites dwelling among the ten tribes. Jeroboam therefore drove from his realm the Levites and priests (2 Chron. 11: 13, 14), and in their place appointed

other priests, "whosoever would, he consecrated him" (1 Kings 13: 33). The moral disorder to which this priesthood of the northern kingdom fell a prey is shown in Hos. 4: 6-14; 6: 9. It is, however, evident from several allusions in the prophets Amos and Hosea, that many Mosaic forms of worship were practiced in the sanctuaries of the northern kingdom. For though the date of these prophets is more than a century later, it is certain that such forms of Jehovistic worship as existed in their days in the kingdom of the ten tribes could not have been introduced subsequently to Jeroboam, but must have been handed down from ancient times in this kingdom. We see that the celebration of the Sabbaths, New Moons, and festivals still continued (Hos. 2: 13; 9: 5; Amos 5: 21; 8: 5, 10); that the different kinds of Mosaic sacrifices were in use (Amos 4: 5; 5: 22); that the priests partook of the sin-offerings (Hos. 4: 8-10); while Amos 4: 4 contains allusions to the tithes of the third year. All this is of the greatest importance with respect to the criticism of the Mosaic legislation. *None of these institutions would have been imported from the kingdom of Judah, unless the consecration of a high antiquity had rested upon them.*

Four kings reigned during the twenty years intervening between the death of Jeroboam (955 B.C.) and the ascension of Omri (930 B.C.),¹ but they all walked in the ways of Jeroboam.

[Analysis: 1) Jeroboam introduces image worship; 2) expels the Levites and priests; 3) appoints priests who were not of the sons of Levi; 4) introduced many of the Mosaic forms of worship; 5) the testimony of Hosea and Amos; 6) bearing upon Higher Criticism; 7) the kings of this period.]

¹ Jeroboam 976 B. C.; Nadab 955 B. C.; Baasha 954 B. C.; Elah 931 B. C.; Zimri 930 B. C.; Omri 930 B. C.

§ 173. The Dynasty of Omri (930–884 B. C.).

The dynasty raised to the throne in Omri possessed the kingdom for more than forty years. Under Omri, the royal residence was transferred from Tirzah to the city of Samaria, of which he was the builder (1 Kings 16: 24), and which now became the capital of the kingdom. During Omri's reign the worship of Jehovah, though in an idolatrous form, had still been the national religion, but the marriage of Omri's son, *Ahab* (919–898 B. C.) with the Phœnician princess *Jezebel*, had a disastrous effect upon the religious condition of the country. At the instigation of the queen the worship of Baal and Ashera was set up, and a temple built for Baal in Samaria itself (1 Kings 16: 32, 33). Against the prophets of Jehovah a sanguinary persecution arose (1 Kings 18: 4, 15), and they were put to death wherever the queen could lay hands on them.

At this period the conflict with triumphant heathenism was waged by the individual in whom was reflected the full glory of the Old Testament prophetship. *Elijah the Tishbite* was a prophet of fire, whose word burnt like a torch, and whose very name "Jehovah is my God," testified against the apostate and irresolute race (1 Kings 17: 1–2 Kings 2: 11). *Elisha* was appointed by the Divine command to succeed Elijah (2 Kings 2: 15–13: 21).

The many *miracles* which appear in the history of Elijah and his successor Elisha are peculiar, no miracles being ordinarily attributed to the prophets of the Old Testament. Here, as well as at the Exodus from Egypt, it appears that the agency of miracles was chiefly employed when the point at issue was to prove the existence of the living God, as against the worshipers of the false gods.

[**Analysis:** 1) The reign of Omri; 2) of his son Ahab; 3) Jezebel; 4) Elijah; 5) Elisha; 6) the aim of miracles.]

§ 174. The Prophetism of the Period. The Rechabites.

It is probable that the schools of the prophets were revived by Elijah, for the purpose of providing a kind of religious fulcrum for the people who were cut off from the lawful sanctuary and worship at Jerusalem, and raise up men who would labor for the quickening of their spiritual life. Not less than three of these institutions are found within a tolerably limited area, and at the very headquarters of idolatry, viz: at Bethel (2 Kings 2: 3), at Jericho (2 Kings 2: 5), and at Gilgal (2 Kings 4: 38). About one hundred sons of the prophets sat before Elisha at Gilgal, and their number at Jericho could hardly have been less. The name, sons of the prophets, which is not used of the association of prophets under Samuel, but first appears 1 Kings 20: 35, points to an *educational relation*. From these communities the prophets seem to have traversed the country, for the purpose of exercising their ministry among the people.

Ordinarily there seems to have been no special ceremony for consecrating prophets to their office. The succession to the office was not connected with any legal ceremony, nor dependent on human appointment, but is said to have rested solely on the direct call and consecration of God (Amos 7: 15; Isa. 6: 8, 9; etc.).

These schools of the prophets served the people of the northern kingdom as a substitute for the legitimate sanctuary. With regard to their maintenance, the prophets seem in general to have been dependent upon voluntary contributions (1 Kings 14: 3).

It was from a school of the prophets that the

overthrow of the dynasty of Omri proceeded. *Jehu* was anointed king over Israel by one of the sons of the prophets, and Elisha charged him with the execution of the curse pronounced by Elijah on the house of Ahab (1 Kings 21: 21–29). Jezreel was immediately surprised by Jehu, and Jehoram, his mother Jezebel, and the whole house of Ahab were slain (2 Kings 9).

In this work assistance was afforded to Jehu by Jehonadab the son of Rechab (2 Kings 10: 15, 23), who is also known from Jer. 35: 6, as the founder of the *Rechabites*, a kind of nomadic ascetics, belonging, according to 1 Chron. 2: 55, to the Kenites. According to the statement of Jeremiah (35: 6–11), the Rechabites were bound to sow no seed, to plant no vineyards, and to drink no wine. The now current notion that the Rechabites were connected with Nazaritism may be correct, but there is no authority for regarding them as Nazarites properly speaking.

[Analysis: 1) Elijah and the schools of the prophets; 2) Elisha; 3) the prophets were directly called by God; 4) their office and maintenance; 5) the dynasty of Omri was overthrown by them; 6) the Rechabites.]

§ 175. The Dynasty of Jehu (884–784 B. C.).

Jehu's dynasty maintained itself on the throne for more than a century, a longer period than that of any other. But Jehu's reformation stopped half way. He indeed extirpated the worship of Baal, but the illegal worship at Dan and Bethel, and also the Ashera at Samaria, were left unmolested (2 Kings 13: 6). The state of the kingdom under Jehu (884–856 B. C.), and still more under his son and successor Jehoahaz (856–841 B. C.), was in a political aspect a very unfortunate one. But when the kingdom was reduced to the last extremity, the dying Elisha

promised to the dejected Joash (841–824 B. c.), the son and successor of Jehoahaz, victory over the Syrians (2 Kings 13:14–19), and the prophet *Jonah*, the son of Amittai subsequently predicted the restoration of the ancient boundaries of the kingdom (2 Kings 14: 25). Joash was successful in his war against Damascus and Judah, but the glory of the kingdom was still further enhanced under his valiant son Jeroboam II. (824–784 B. c.). External success, however, effected no internal change, and the state was hastening toward those judgments which the prophets *Amos* and *Hosea* were raised up to proclaim.

[Analysis: 1) The character of Jehu's reign; 2) of that of Jehoahaz; 3) of Joash; 4) of Jeroboam II.; 5) the judgments proclaimed by the prophets.]

§ 176. From Zachariah to the Captivity of the Ten Tribes (772–721 B. c.).

After the death of Jeroboam, dreadful disorders broke out in Samaria (Hos. 4). An interregnum in Samaria of at least twelve years must be admitted. *Zachariah* (772 B. c.), the son of Jeroboam fell a victim to a conspiracy six months after his accession, and thus was fulfilled the doom prophesied against his house. *Shallum* (771 B. c.), the murderer of Zachariah, was himself slain, after a reign of one month, by *Menahem* (771–760 B. c.), 2 Kings 15: 13, 14. The horrors of these days are depicted by Hosea (7: 1–16).

A decided turn was now given to affairs; for Menahem smoothed the way for *Pul*, king of Assyria, to enter the country, and thus laid the foundation of Israel's dependence on Assyria. Menahem purchased Pul's assistance, in confirming him in the kingdom, by heavy sacrifices (2 Kings 15: 19, 20). This was the *first stage of the threatened judgment*.

In Samaria was henceforth developed that unhappy policy, which, while on the one hand courting the Assyrians, was on the other secretly combining with Egypt for the purpose of throwing off, by her assistance, the Assyrian yoke. In opposition to this, the *prophets* made it their business to inculcate a higher policy, by a consistent assertion of the theocratic principle, which was simply this, that Israel should never court the protection of worldly power, but seek assistance from God alone (Hos. 5: 13, 14; 7: 8-16; etc.). Such exhortations, however, found no audience; and the prophets were despised and persecuted as fools (Hos. 9: 7).

The coming ruin was hastened by *Pekah*, who, after slaying *Pekahiah*, the son of Menahem, ascended the throne in 758 B. c. Towards the close of his reign, the Assyrian monarch *Tiglath-Pileser* took the provinces east of the Jordan and Galilee, and carried away the tribes inhabiting these regions into the interior of Asia, about 740 B. c. (2 Kings 15: 29). This was the *second stage of the judgment*. *Hoshea*, who obtained the throne by conspiring against and slaying *Pekah*, became tributary to the Assyrian king *Shalmanezzer*, but sought, by concluding an alliance with *So*, king of Egypt, to release himself from his dependence. *Shalmanezzer* immediately marched into the land of Israel, and Samaria was taken after a three years' siege, not by *Shalmanezzer*, but, as is now settled by the cuneiform inscriptions, by his successor, *Sargon*. The people were led into *captivity* 721 B. c., and thus *was the Judgment* accomplished (2 Kings 17: 7-23). The dwelling-places assigned to the exiles were situated in Media and the upper provinces of Assyria (2 Kings 17: 6).

[**Analysis:** 1) The interregnum in Samaria; 2) Hosea depicts the horrors from the period from 772—760 B. C.; 3) Pul, the king of Assyria; 4) the policy of the kings of Israel; 5) the exhortations of the prophets; 6) Tiglath-Pileser; 7) Sargon; 8) the captivity of the Ten Tribes.]

§ 177. Origin of the Samaritans.

In place of the Israelites who were carried into exile, colonies from central Asia were planted in the depopulated country by Sargon (2 Kings 17: 24). Esarhaddon, the son of Sennacherib, also sent colonies into the still sparsely peopled land (Ezra 4: 2). These, to avert the judgments which befell them, mingled the worship of Jehovah, as the God of the land, with the heathen religions they had brought with them from their respective homes (2 Kings 17: 25—41). Thus arose the so-called *Samaritans* or Cuthites, as they were named by the Jews, from Cuthah, the native country of a portion of them. *Two views* are held with respect to these Samaritans. 1) Some hold that they were not a purely heathen people, but a mixed race arising from the intermarriage of the new colonists with the remnants of the ten tribes which were left in the land. 2) The other and older view is, that the Samaritans proceeded from wholly heathen races, a view, in modern times, re-advocated especially by Hengstenberg. The Old Testament passages (2 Kings 17: 24—41; Ezra 4: 2, 9, 10) favor the second view. Nevertheless, even under Josiah (639—608 B. C.), remnants of Manasseh, Ephraim, and of the rest of Israel, are assumed as still dwelling in the northern regions (2 Chron. 34: 9), and the men from Shechem, Shiloh, and Samaria, named in Jer. 41: 5 as mourning for the destruction of Jerusalem were undoubtedly Israelites. Besides, the total deportation of the entire population of so important a district is hardly to be

supposed possible. This much, however, is certain, that the Israelitish element among the Samaritans, must by no means be computed as so considerable as is generally the case.

[Analysis: 1) The origin of the Samaritans; 2) two views have been advocated; 3) evidently a mixed race; 4) the Israelitish element the weakest.]

CHAPTER V.

THE KINGDOM OF JUDAH.

§ 178. Preliminary Remarks and Survey.

The history of the kingdom of Judah has a character essentially different from that of the kingdom of Israel. Though much smaller, it was still superior to that kingdom in internal strength. This resulted partly from its possession of the genuine sanctuary with its legitimate worship, its influential priesthood, and Levitical orders; and partly from its royal house, which had not been raised to the throne by revolution, but possessed the sanction of legitimacy and a settled succession, and was especially consecrated by the memory of its illustrious ancestor David, and the Divine promises vouchsafed to his race. Moreover, among the nineteen monarchs (of course not counting Athaliah) who occupied the throne from Rehoboam till the fall of the state, there were at least some individuals distinguished for high administrative talents, in whom the ideal of the theocratic kingship was revived, such as Jehosaphat (915–893 B. C.), Hezekiah (727–696 B. C.), Josiah (639–608 B. C.). Since the preservation of the theocratic ordinances did not devolve in Judah exclusively upon the prophets, their position was different from that which they occupied in the kingdom of the ten tribes. There is no sort of evidence that schools of the prophets, or associations such as existed in the kingdom of the ten tribes, were organized in Judah. In the historical notices of the kingdom of Judah we

meet only with individual prophets, a succession of whom continues, with but inconsiderable gaps, down to the captivity, and it was only around eminent prophets like Isaiah (760–690 B. c.) (Isa. 8: 16), and afterwards Jeremiah (628–583 B. c.), that small circles of disciples were gathered.

[Analysis: 1) The internal strength of the kingdom of Judah; 2) its three great kings; 3) the office of the prophets.]

§ 179. Rehoboam to Jehosaphat (976–893 B. c.).

The history of Judah under Rehoboam (976–959 B. c.) and Abijah (959–956 B. c.) offers little that is worthy of notice. External misfortunes were added to the internal declension occasioned by the spread of idolatry. Then followed the *first* reformation under Asa (956–915 B. c.). *Jehosaphat* (915–893 B. c.), the son of Asa, one of the best rulers of the house of David, was still more zealous for the establishment of the theocratic ordinances. To promote religious knowledge among the people, a commission, consisting of five high officials, two priests, and nine Levites, was sent about the country with the book of the law to instruct the people (2 Chron. 17: 7–9). Under Jehosaphat not only did the priesthood attain great influence, but the powerful prophets Jehu (2 Chron. 19: 2) and Eliezer (2 Chron. 20: 37) also exercised their office during his reign. Externally the reign of Jehosaphat was prosperous.

[Analysis: 1) The reigns of Rehoboam and Abijah; 2) the reformation of Asa; 3) the glorious reign of Jehosaphat.]

§ 108. Jehoram to Jotham (893–741 B. c.).

Jehoram (893–885 B. c.), the son of Jehosaphat, one of the worst kings of Judah, was married to *Athaliah*, a daughter of Ahab and Jezebel. He became a zealous promoter of the Phœnician idolatry, and his

reign was also unfortunate externally. Their son, Ahaziah, after scarcely one year's reign, was slain along with the whole house of Ahab, on the occasion of a visit which he was paying to his royal relatives in Israel (2 Chron. 22: 6-9). *Athaliah*, the daughter of Jezebel, who was worthy of her mother, now ruled absolutely at Jerusalem (884-878 B. c.). In an insurrection Athaliah was slain, and Joash (878-838 B. c.), a young son of Ahaziah, who was saved from the fury of his grandmother Athaliah by being concealed in the temple during six years, was raised to the throne. In the beginning of his reign the worship of Jehovah flourished, and it is to this period that the book of the prophet Joel must be assigned. In the latter part of the reign of Joash, however, idolatry, through the influence of the nobles, again got the upper hand, and after a very unsuccessful war against the Syrians, Joash fell a victim to a conspiracy. A similar fate was experienced by his son Amaziah (838-809 B. c.), and Uzziah (809-757 B. c.) ascended the throne at a time of great disorder. The kingdom of Judah during his reign and that of his son Jotham (757-741 B. c.) attained a degree of power such as it had not possessed since the disruption. Still, notwithstanding the general adherence of Uzziah and Jotham to the theocratic ordinances (2 Kings 15: 3, 34), the moral and religious condition of the people was not satisfactory. The characteristics of the times are described in Isa. 2: 5-8; 5: 18-23.

[Analysis: 1) The reign of Jehoram; 2) of Ahaziah; 3) of Athaliah; 4) of Joash; 5) of Amaziah; 6) of Uzziah; 7) of Jotham; 8) the prophet Joel; 9) Isaiah.]

§ 181. Ahaz and Hezekiah (741-696 B. c.).

During the reign of the weak and idolatrous Ahaz (741-727 B. c.) Judah experienced a series of mis-

fortunes. When the heart of Ahaz and the heart of his people were moved as the trees of the wood are moved by the wind (Isa. 7: 2), the help of the God of Israel was offered him in vain by Isaiah. During his reign the worship of idols was openly practiced in Jerusalem itself (2 Kings 16: 3, 4; 2 Chron. 28; 2-4).

Better things were to be expected of the pious and powerful Hezekiah (727-696 B. C.), under whom Isaiah zealously labored, and who also humbly received the testimony given at Jerusalem by the prophet Micah (Jer. 26: 18, 19). But moral corruption was found everywhere, and instead of patiently submitting to the Assyrian yoke as a just punishment, as Isaiah called upon them to do (Isa. 10: 24-27; 30: 15-18), the nobles in Jerusalem were continually plotting to revolt from Assyria and urged the king to ally himself with Egypt. This revolt took place soon after the accession of *Sennacherib*, who, on his march toward Egypt invaded and devastated Judah. Sennacherib at first appears to have been pacified by an enormous tribute (2 Kings 18: 13-16), but afterwards broke his engagement and marched against Jerusalem. Hezekiah indeed used every means possible for the defence of the city (2 Chron. 32: 3-6; Isa. 22: 9-11), but so desperate was the state of affairs, that Hezekiah knew of no other refuge than that of prayer. The deliverance took place, by the destruction of the Assyrian army, on the very night before Sennacherib advanced to attack the city (Isa. 36: 1-37: 37; 2 Kings 18: 13-19: 36). This event probably occurred in the neighborhood of Jerusalem, and may be supposed to have been effected by a pestilence. A description of this occurrence is given from an Egyptian standpoint in Herodotus (Book 2: 141).

[Analysis: 1) The reign of Ahaz; 2) of Hezekiah; 3) the expedition of Sennacherib; 4) the deliverance of Jerusalem.]

§ 182. Manasseh and Amon (696–639 B. c.).

Judah was fast ripening for judgment under the two kings *Manasseh* (696–641 B. c.) and *Amon* (641–639 B. c.), who systematically set to work to overthrow the worship of Jehovah, and to re-establish the undisputed supremacy of idolatry. While no trace of resistance to the abomination of Manasseh is to be discovered on the part of the priesthood, there were at least prophets who raised their voices against them (2 Kings 21: 10), and were among the innocent blood with which Manasseh filled Jerusalem (2 Kings 21: 16; 24: 4). According to tradition, Isaiah was also among the victims of Manasseh.

[Analysis: 1) The reign of Manasseh; 2) of Amon; 3) the death of Isaiah.]

§ 183. Josiah (639–608 B. c.).

This period opens with the last struggle of the theocratic principle against the idolatry and immorality of the people, and with the last temporary elevation of the kingdom under *Josiah* (639–608 B. c.). In the eighteenth year of his reign (at the age of twenty-six), Hilkiah the high priest found the *book of the law*, which during the sixty years' public supremacy of heathenism had fallen into oblivion.¹ The king, struck with fear when he heard the curses threatened for apostacy, took the most strenuous measure for the complete extirpation of idolatry, but this reformation effected only an external prevalence of the forms of the legitimate worship, and was unable to produce in the degenerate nation a real purification of faith and morals.

¹ It is not necessary to discuss the various hypotheses, as to the nature of this lost "book of the law," as presented by the negative Higher Critics. It is highly probable that this Book of the Law was the autograph copy of Moses, which had been laid up beside the ark,—and not simply a forgery, nor the lately written book of Deuteronomy, but the whole Pentateuch.

Upon *Jeremiah* especially, whose call was nearly contemporary with the appearance of *Zephaniah* and the commencement of Josiah's reforms, devolved at this period, the advocacy of the cause of God.

Analysis: 1) The reign of Josiah; 2) the finding of the Book of the Law; 3) the prophets Jeremiah and Zephaniah]

§ 184. Profane History at this Period. Jehoahaz (608 B. C.).

Judah was involved in the great battles which arose in connection with the fall of Nineveh. Necho, king of Egypt, appeared with an army in Palestine, on his way to Assyria (2 Chron. 35: 21), and Josiah attempted to obstruct his march. A battle was fought between them at *Megiddo*, on the plain of Jezreel, in which the Jewish army was defeated, and Josiah, mortally wounded, died soon after at Jerusalem (2 Kings 23: 29; 2 Chron. 35: 20-25). Jehoahaz was, after a reign of three months, summoned to the Egyptian camp at Riblah, on the northern boundary of Palestine, and there imprisoned, while Eliakim was set up in his stead as an Egyptian vassal king, by the name of *Jehoiakim*. Jehoahaz was afterwards removed to Egypt, where he died (2 Chron. 36: 1-4; 2 Kings 23: 31-35; Jer. 22: 10-12).

[Analysis: 1) The fall of Nineveh; 2) the battle of Megiddo; 3) the death of Josiah; 4) the reign of Jehoahaz.]

§ 185. Jehoiakim and Jehoiachin (608-598 B. C.).

In Jehoiakim (608-598 B. C.) Judah received a king who surpassed the worst of his ancestors in badness. Idolatry was again openly practiced, and all the reforms of Josiah were obliterated. A grievous period of affliction and persecution now set in for *Jeremiah*. Disgrace and persecution were heaped upon the prophet, who undauntedly and incessantly contended

against the prevailing idolatry and wickedness, and against the degenerate priests and false prophets who now appeared in great numbers, and sought by their deceptions to invalidate the testimony of the true prophet. After the destruction of Nineveh in 606 B. c., in which the prophecy of *Nahum*, probably a younger contemporary of Isaiah, was fulfilled, matters took a new turn in Hither Asia. After the battle of Carchemish (605 B. c.), a fortress situated on the Euphrates, all Hither Asia fell into the hands of Nebuchadnezzar (2 Kings 24: 7). Jeremiah now announced, in the spirit of prophecy, the purpose for which the Chaldean power was appointed by God, and its predetermined duration of seventy years (Jer. 25: 11, 12). When Nebuchadnezzar took possession of Jerusalem, he carried off to Babylon a part of the vessels of the temple, and certain noble youths, including Daniel. Jehoiakim himself was put in chains to be taken to Babylon (2 Chron. 36: 6), but was afterward left behind as the vassal of the Chaldean empire. Three years after, Jehoiakim rebelled (2 Kings 24: 1), but died during the war, 599 or 598 B. c. His son *Jehoiachin* (Coniah) then succeeded, but was dethroned after a reign of three months by Nebuchadnezzar, who now came and carried him away, together with the nobles, men of war, and priests, to Babylon. This was the *second deportation*, and by it the better portion of the people was taken into captivity. Among those carried to Babylon was *Ezekiel*, who from the fifth year of his captivity onward filled the office of prophet to the exiles at Chebar.

[Analysis: 1) The reign of Jehoiakim; 2) the persecution of Jeremiah; 3) the destruction of Nineveh; 4) the fulfilment of the prophecy of Nahum; 5) the battle of Carchemish; 6) Jerusalem captured; 7) Daniel; 8) the second deportation; 9) Ezekiel.]

§ 186. **Zedekiah. Fall of the State and of Jerusalem** (598–586 B. C.).

Zedekiah (598–588) B. C.), the last king of Judah, was a weak prince, who lived in shameful dependence upon the low upstarts who had now seized upon power. Although he had sworn fealty to Nebuchadnezzar (2 Chron. 36: 13), he nevertheless, in the ninth year of his reign, openly broke his oath, and concluded an alliance with the Egyptian king. In vain had Jeremiah warned him, by repeatedly declaring the Divine appointment of Nebuchadnezzar to be the instrument of judgment to Judah and the surrounding nations. When Nebuchadnezzar appeared before Jerusalem, Jeremiah counseled the surrender of the city. But the nobles cast Jeremiah into prison, who, however, was secretly released by the king, and kept in the court of the prison (Jer. 37: 11–21). A second time he was cast into a dungeon by the princes that he might there perish with hunger, but was again delivered by the king (Jer. 38: 6–13).

After a siege of eighteen months, a breach was made in the fortifications, and Zedekiah was captured, and after his sons had been executed before his eyes, was deprived of his sight and taken in chains to Babylon (Jer. 39: 1–7; 2 Kings 25: 1–7). *The destruction of Jerusalem and the third deportation of the people* was effected by the Chaldean general Nebuzaradan (2 Kings 25: 8–11; Jer. 39: 8–14), 588 B. C. With ferocious exultation, the neighboring states, and especially the Edomites hastened to the spot, to feast their eyes upon the spectacle of the fall of this detested people (Ps. 137: 7; Ezek. 35: 15; 36: 5).

[Analysis: 1) The last king of Judah; 2) the prophecies of Jeremiah; 3) the destruction of Jerusalem; 3) the exultation of the enemies of Israel.]

§ 187. Gedaliah and the Remnant of the People.

A remnant of the people, among whom was *Jeremiah*, was left in the land (Jer. 39: 11–14; 40: 1–6); and fields and vineyards were assigned to them by Nebuzaradan (Jer. 39: 10). Nebuchadnezzar placed over them as his viceroy *Gedaliah*, a son of the prince Ahikam, who had a high official position under Josiah (2 Kings 22: 12). The viceroyship of Gedaliah, however, lasted only two months, for he was treacherously slain at a banquet (2 Kings 25: 23–26). The Jews who were still remaining, fearing the vengeance of Nebuchadnezzar, determined in spite of the warnings of Jeremiah to emigrate to Egypt, whither the prophet also followed them. Jeremiah was here also constrained to exercise his office of reprover, and probably terminated his storm-tossed life in this country, according to patristic tradition, being stoned by his fellow-countrymen. To this period belong Jer. 40–44.

[Analysis: 1) A remnant of the people was left in Palestine; 2) Gedaliah; 3) emigration to Egypt; 4) the prophecies of Jeremiah.]

CHAPTER VI.

THE EXILIC AND POST-EXILIC HISTORY OF THE JEWS.

§ 188. Condition of the People and Agency of the Prophets during the Captivity.

The condition of the Jews in captivity does not seem, so far as we can ascertain from the writings of Jeremiah and Ezekiel, to have been one of special oppression (Jer. 29: 4-7). The same word of prophecy, whose truth was proved by the judgment which had fallen upon them, exhorted them to wait with patience for the hour when the deliverance of Israel should appear in the doom of Babylon. As the kingship and priesthood were annulled, the leadership of the people devolved exclusively on the *prophets*. Perhaps it was from the custom which now arose among the Israelites, of gathering around a prophet to hear the word of God, that *Synagogues* originated. But the prophets of God had, during the captivity, a mission to fulfil to the *heathen* also. The conflict waged by Jehovah against the gods of the land, when he delivered his people out of Egypt, was renewed with increased intensity at Babylon. To carry on his struggle was the special vocation of *Daniel*, who was educated at the Babylonian court, in all the wisdom of the Chaldees, and raised to the highest honors.

[Analysis: 1) The condition of the people during the exile; 2) the prophets became the leaders of the people; 3) the origin of the Synagogues; 4) the mission of the prophets to the heathen; 5) Daniel.]

§ 189. Deliverance and Return of the Jews from Babylon. Commencement of the Re-building of the Temple.

After *Cyrus* had ascended the Medo-Babylonian throne, he gave the Jews permission, in the first year of his reign, to return to Palestine and to rebuild their destroyed temple at Jerusalem (2 Chron. 36: 22, 23; Ezra 1: 1–11). The act of Cyrus can only be explained by the *religious* interest which he took in the Jews, and is not to be explained on other grounds. The return from Babylon took place under the conduct of *Zerubbabel*, a hereditary prince of the tribe of Judah, who was made the Persian viceroy. With him was associated, as spiritual ruler of the people, the high priest Joshua. Under the direction of these men, 42,360 Israelites (Ezra 2: 64; Neh. 7: 66) with more than 7,000 bondmen and bondwomen returned to Palestine. These belonged for the most part to the tribe of *Judah*, but individuals belonging to other tribes may also have been found among the band. The returned Jews at first assembled for the worship of God at an altar set up for the purpose, but preparations were immediately made for the re-building of the temple (Ezra 2: 68, 69; 3: 7–9). It was a time of hearty enthusiasm, which showed itself more especially at the laying of the foundations of the temple in the second month of the following year (Ezra 3: 3–10). The newly settled nation was, however, to experience grievous trials. The *Samaritans*, whose desire to obtain a share in the new temple was rejected, revenged themselves by intriguing at the Persian court to hinder the building, which now ceased till the second year of Darius Hystaspes (Ezra 4: 1–5).

[Analysis: 1) The edict of Cyrus; 2) the return under Zerubbabel; 3) the re-building of the temple; 4) the hatred of the Samaritans.]

§ 190. The Period from Cyrus to Darius Hystaspes.

Of this interval we have no account, for the section Ezra 4: 6–23 refers to the period of Xerxes and Artaxerxes. In the whole period from Cyrus to Darius Hystaspes, hindrances to the building of the temple are only mentioned, and Ezra 4: 5 should be immediately followed by ver. 24. In the sixth month of the second year of Darius (520 B. C.), the prophet *Haggai* was raised up to encourage the viceroy Zerubbabel by prophecy, and revive the hopes of the people in their promised redemption. When, however, the meanness of the building (Hag. 2: 3; Zech. 4: 10) produced fresh despondency, the people were comforted by Haggai and by Zechariah. As, in spite of all difficulties, the building of the temple would now be successfully accomplished (Zech. 4: 7–9), so also was redemption assured to them. Soon that great shaking of the nations would take place, in which the heathen powers would wear each other out (Hag. 2: 6, 21; Zech. 2: 1–4). Then would the kingdom of God, into which the Gentiles should be incorporated, and to which they should dedicate all their treasures, triumph (Hag. 2: 7–9; Zech. 8: 20–23). When Darius heard of the rebuilding of the temple he not only commanded that no hindrance should be laid in the way, but even granted state assistance both for the rebuilding and for the regular maintenance of the sacrifices. The building consequently proceeded and the temple was finished and dedicated in the sixth year of Darius, 516 B. C. (Ezra 5 and 6).

[Analysis: 1) Hindrances to the building of the temple; 2) the prophets Haggai and Zechariah; 3) the dedication of the temple.]

§ 191. The Jews under Xerxes. Beginning of Ezra's Administration.

We have no information concerning the condition of the people in Palestine during the next fifty-eight years, except the short paragraph in Ezra 4: 6, which refers to the time of Xerxes. On the other hand the occurrences *in Persia*, to which the book of Esther refers, belong to this period, to the reign of Xerxes.

In the time of *Artaxerxes Longimanus* the thread of the history of the Jewish settlement in the Holy Land is again taken up, first by the book of Ezra (Chap. 7), in the seventh year of this monarch (Ezra 7: 7), 458 B. C. We find the colony in Palestine at this time in a state of great depression. Matters took a turn for the better, when Ezra brought a second band of Israelites into Judea. He began his work of reformation by the dismissal of all the heathen wives. Of Ezra's subsequent administration during the next twelve years, nothing is narrated. What happened during the period may be inferred from the record in Ezra 4: 7-23.

[Analysis: 1) The Jews under Xerxes; 2) under Artaxerxes; 3) Ezra's administration.]

§ 192. Ezra and Nehemiah. The Close of Prophecy.

Nehemiah, who was sent to Jerusalem by Artaxerxes in the 20th year of that monarch's reign (445 B. C.), with the authority of governor, effected the restoration of the walls and gates of Jerusalem, and set heartily to work at the removal of internal sores. Ezra also now began to act in his capacity of a teacher of the law. To Ezra must be attributed not a re-foundation of the theocracy, but only a restoration of the ordinances of the law. He was the *founder of Judaism proper*; and in this very fact lies his great importance in the history also of the kingdom of God.

After a twelve years' sojourn in Palestine, Nehemiah returned to Persia (433 B. c.). New abuses sprang up during his absence, and he returned for a second time, probably before the death of Artaxerxes (424 B. c.). During the time of his second governorship, Malachi, the last of the canonical prophets of the Old Testament, exercised his ministry. From the Book of Malachi we learn that an external legalism, which subsequently developed into Pharisaism, had now taken possession of the masses. With the promise of the Divine Messenger, who was, in the power of Elijah, to prepare the way for the Lord who was coming to His temple (Mal. 3: 1; 4: 5), the prophecies of the Old Testament conclude.¹

[Analysis: 1) The work of Nehemiah; 2) the importance of the work of Ezra; 3) Malachi, the last prophet; 4) Jewish apocalyptic literature.]

§ 193. The Beginning of Sopherism. Public Worship at the Close of this Period.

In place of the prophets the *Scribes* or *Sopherim* now appear, of whom Ezra was the prototype and representative (Ezra 7: 6, 10). Tradition assigns to him a college of scribes, under the name of *the great Synagogue*, as sharers in his work of organization, but the historical books of the Old Testament know of no such authority. From this time on, however, the scribes, who diligently applied themselves to the study and exposition of the law, formed a separate class. The priests, as such, were now restricted to the per-

¹ Jewish apocalyptic literature,—such as the Book of Enoch, the Jewish Sibyllines, the Fourth Book of Ezra, the Psalter of Solomon,—is an aftergrowth of prophecy and the product of reflection. It bears the character of secret literature, and undoubtedly originated in those narrower circles in which the hopes of Israel were kept alive, when prophecy ceased, by the study of the prophetic word. No prophet, properly so called, is known by Judaism after Malachi.

formance of religious rites and the transactions connected therewith. By the side of those services of the temple which were connected with the priesthood, was more and more developed the service of the *synagogue*, with the reading and exposition of the law,—a service whose administration devolved upon the scribes. This now formed the actual centre of the religious life of Judaism.

[Analysis: 1) The Scribes; 2) the Great Synagogue; 3) the origin of the synagogue.]

SECTION II.

THE THEOLOGY OF PROPHECY.

§ 194. Summary.

The theology of Mosaism is further developed by prophecy, especially in the following respects:

1. With regard to the doctrine of God and of His relation to the world, with which is connected a further expansion of angelology.

2. The intrinsically moral nature of the law is further developed by prophecy; in other words, the doctrine of sin and of righteousness is further unfolded.

3. The communion of man with God culminates in Prophecy.

4. The progress of the kingdom of God forms the essential matter of prophecy.

CHAPTER VII.

THE DOCTRINE OF THE LORD OF HOSTS AND OF ANGELS.

§ 195. Jehovah Sabaoth. Partial Views concerning its Original Meaning.

The full expression of this name of God is *Jehovah, God of Sabaoth* (Hebrew *Tsebhaoth*). *Sabaoth* never appears alone as a name of God in the Hebrew text of the Old Testament. Nor does *Jehovah Sabaoth* occur as the Divine name in the Pentateuch, Joshua, or Judges. It is first mentioned in the narrative of the times of Eli; and it is by this name that Hannah in-

vokes God (1 Sam. 1: 11). The name seems to have been especially in use in the days of Samuel and David. It sometimes appears in the Psalms, but only in the first three books. In the Books of the Kings it seldom occurs, and only in the mouths of the prophets Elijah and Elisha. In the prophetical books it is most frequently found in Amos, Isaiah, Jeremiah, Haggai, Zechariah, and Malachi.

This name, according to its original meaning, is said by many to designate Jehovah as the *God of battles of His people*, who are called "the armies" or "hosts" of the Lord (Ex. 7: 4; 12: 41). But though it is true, that there is in this name a reference to the fact that God manifests Himself in irresistible power against the enemies of His people, yet if this were its original meaning, it is strange that the name did not make its appearance in those ancient times which were expressly the times of the great theocratic conflicts ("the wars of Jehovah" Num. 21: 14); and again that it did not originate, but was already in use, in the warlike age of David. A higher notion is involved in the expression, namely this, that the fact that the God of the armies of Israel *is also* the Lord of Hosts makes Him so terrible a God.

A second view appeals to Gen. 2: 1, where it understands the expression *Tsebhaoth* as applying to the creatures in general, who together compose the great army of the Lord. So that according to this view it is the majesty of God in general, as displayed in His dominion over the whole creation, which this name expresses.

The true explanation of the name, however, must be derived from the phrase *host of heaven*.

[Analysis: 1) The name Jehovah Sabaoth; 2) where found; 3) its original meaning; 4) a second view; 5) true explanation.]

§ 196. The Host of Heaven. 1. The Heavenly Bodies.

The host of heaven in the Old Testament includes the heavenly bodies and the celestial spirits. The Old Testament distinctly maintains not only the creaturehood of the heavenly host (Ps. 33: 6), but also the distinction of the two above named classes. It is only by a poetical personification that the stars are spoken of in the song of Deborah (Judg. 5: 20) as the warriors of the Lord, who, leaving their courses, descend to fight for Israel against Sisera, and that the morning stars are said in Job 38: 7 to have joined with the angels in celebrating the morning of creation. The heavenly bodies are declared to be merely light-bearers, created by God, and as such subserving earthly purposes (Ps. 104: 19-23). They manifest, indeed, by their splendor and their course, the greatness and wisdom of the Creator (Ps. 8: 3; 19: 1-6; Job. 9: 9; 38: 31-33; etc.), but their brilliancy admits of no comparison with the Divine glory (Job. 25: 5). Thus they are the hosts of God whom His almighty will commands (Isa. 40: 26; 45: 12); they serve to proclaim and to glorify His judgments (Joel 3: 15; Isa. 13: 10; Hab. 3: 11). Their creaturehood is shown by the fact that they as well as the terrestrial creation are transitory (Isa. 34: 3; 51: 6; Ps. 102: 26, 27).

[Analysis: 1) What is included among the host of heaven; 2) the stars are personified; 3) they are the light-bearers; 4) manifest the glory of God; 5) but are transitory.]

§ 197. 2. The Host of the Heavenly Spirits.

The Old Testament speaks of the host of heavenly spirits, the armies of the sons of God, the angels, in a three-fold aspect:

1. They form the *higher church*, which, standing at the head of the choir of the universe, adores God in

the heavenly sanctuary (Ps. 148: 2). From this central point of the Divine glory, proceed all God's manifestations of grace and judgment to the world (Mic. 1: 2, 3; Hab. 2: 20; etc.). In Ps. 89: 5--7 the sons of God (angels) are called the congregation of the saints, who are constantly praising the wonders of Divine grace. Their near relation to God is shown ver. 7, where they are designated "the council of the holy ones." The meaning of this passage is, that the heavenly hosts, as the appointed instruments of executing God's judgments, are also to be the *witnesses* of His counsels.

2. They are the *messengers of God*, the instrument of executing His will in grace and in judgment for the deliverance of His people and the subjugation of His enemies (Ps. 103: 20, 21; 148: 2). This implies that God's government is carried on by the means of personal and living powers. For the purpose of His kingdom and for the special service of His people, God has chosen the heavenly spirits, who are the companions of man (Ps. 91: 11; 34: 7). In opposition to Satan, whose occupation it is to ruin man (Job. 1), God has thousands of angels whose business it is to be active in the deliverance of human souls.

3. The hosts of heavenly spirits are also appointed to be *His attendant witnesses*, and partially His instruments when He appears in His royal and judicial glory (Deut. 33: 2). In Ps. 68: 17 God is represented as seated upon His throne on Zion, surrounded by the chariots or cavalry of the angelic hosts. Lastly, the heavenly host form Jehovah's retinue at the *final revelation of His judgment*. The angels are "the mighty ones" whom God, according to Joel 3: 11, leads down into the valley of Jehosaphat; they are "the holy ones" with whom, according to Zech. 14: 5, He ap-

pears upon the Mount of Olives in the decisive hour of the last conflict of the covenant people. Compare the description of the procession of the heavenly armies in Rev. 19: 14.

[**Analysis:** 1) The angels are the higher church; 2) the witnesses of God's counsels; 3) the messengers of God; 4) active in serving the saints; 5) the attendant witnesses of God's final revelation at judgment.]

§ 198. Result with Respect to the Name Jehovah Sabaoth.

In summing up what has been said, we find, that the significance of the doctrine of Jehovah Sabaoth consists in the fact that it teaches us to recognize not only the supermundane power and glory of the living God, but also makes Him known to us as interposing, according to His free and sovereign will, in the affairs of the world, and therefore not bound to elements or forces of nature which obey Him; but as having, on the contrary, not only these but also the spiritual powers of the heavenly world at His disposal for the execution of His will on earth. He is the *Omnipotent Ruler of the Universe*. So Ps. 24: 10; Isa 6: 3; 51: 15; 54: 5; etc. The chief passage, however, in this respect, is Jer. 10: 16 in its connection with Jer. 10: 1-10.

[**Analysis:** 1) The significance of the doctrine of Jehovah Sabaoth; 2) God is the Omnipotent Ruler of the Universe.]

§ 199. Angels of Higher Order and their Special Office.

The later prophetic books speak of angels of higher order and special calling among the heavenly host. The *cherubim* are not among these (see § 119). Some have also regarded the *seraphim* as merely symbolical beings, but in Isa. 6, the only passage in which they occur, ver. 6 rather suggests the ministry of angels; though the seraphim here cannot be said entirely to correspond with the interpreting angel in Zechariah and Daniel. The symbolism of their appearance is very

simple. With two wings they cover their faces,—to indicate that even the most exalted spirits cannot bear the full vision of the Divine glory; with two they cover their feet,—to symbolize their reverence; with two they fly,—to express the swiftness with which they execute the Divine commands. In other respects they are evidently represented in human form. The meaning of the word “seraph” is extremely doubtful. It is perhaps best to connect it with the Arabic root *sharupha* (*to be noble*). According to this derivation, the seraphim would be thus designated as being the *most exalted* among celestial spirits.

The *seven angels* mentioned in Ezek. 9 as sent forth to execute the Divine sentence of extermination upon idolatrous Jerusalem, next come under consideration. The number *seven* is here, as elsewhere in the Old Testament, the sign that a Divine operation is being completed,—in this passage the Divine judgment now advancing to its close. One of these angels is distinguished by a high priestly robe of linen, and this angel of special dignity, no doubt, corresponds to the *horseman* who, in the vision of Zech. 1:8, stands among the myrtle trees, and is evidently chief over those who run to and fro through the earth. To him they bring their report; and he, upon receiving it, intercedes with the Lord of Hosts for Jerusalem. He seems also to be identical with the *angel of the Lord* in Zech. 3, before whom Satan stands to accuse Joshua.

We come now to the angels which appear in Daniel under the names *Gabriel* and *Michael*.

Gabriel (*i. e.* man of God) is said to be the angel who explains the visions to Daniel (Dan. 8: 16; 9: 12) thus answering to the *interpreting angel* of Zechariah.

It is, however, the *Michael* of the book of Daniel who apparently corresponds to the angel of the Lord in

Zechariah, the *horseman* among the myrtle trees, who advocates the cause of the covenant people.

But *another appearance* in the book of Daniel now claims our attention. According to Dan. 10, a man, called neither angel nor prince, appears to Daniel on the banks of the Tigris. It is the same person who at Ulai (Dan. 8: 15–17), commands Gabriel to interpret to Daniel the vision he had received,—the same who, in Dan. 12: 7, guarantees by a solemn oath the fulfillment of the Divine counsel. It is obvious that this appearance must be identified with Him who (Dan. 7: 13; 10: 18) comes as *a son of man* in the clouds of heaven to receive dominion over all nations, *i. e.* the *Messiah* (compare the description of the glorified Christ in Rev. 1: 13–15 with Dan. 10: 5, 6).

We find then already in the Old Testament the doctrine, further developed in the New, that the dispensations and judgments of God upon earth are closely connected with corresponding events in the higher world of spirits.

[Analysis: 1) The Seraphim; 2) their symbolism; 3) meaning of “seraph”; 4) the seven angels of Ezek. 9; 5) Gabriel; 6) Michael; 7) the appearance recorded in Dan. 10; 8) summary.]

§ 200. The Doctrine of Satan.

Among the sons of God (angels) who appear before Jehovah, we meet in certain passages of the Old Testament (Job, Chronicles, Zechariah), with an angel called *Satan*, of crafty and hostile disposition toward the covenant people and all who fear God, seeking to deprive them of the favor of God, but only suffered to act as His instrument. The word Satan means an *enemy*, an *adversary*.

If we compare the two parallel passages 2 Sam. 24: 1 and 1 Chron. 21: 1, we learn that what is by the older record (2 Sam. 24: 1) directly referred to Divine

agency, is by the later account attributed to a hostile spirit. We here meet again with the same fact which we encountered in the doctrine of the angels, viz., that the later record brings into greater prominence those powers which are *instruments* of the Divine Providence. Other passages also point to such powers appointed by God to be instruments of the Divine wrath (1 Sam. 16: 14–23; Isa. 19: 14; Ps. 75: 8). The transition hence to the doctrine of Satan is made by the passage 1 Kings 22: 19–23. Satan though absolutely dependent on the Divine will with regard to what he effects, acts from a disposition hostile to man. This is hinted (1 Chron. 21: 1) in the standing up of Satan against Israel, and still more prominently brought forward in the prologue to Job. It is true that in Job Satan appears in the midst of the sons of God (angels); but he comes from a wandering excursion over the earth, which he has evidently undertaken from hostility to men; he hopes, too, that Job's piety will not endure temptation, and that he will thus cease to be an object of the Divine complacency. That he may bring calamity upon Job, the Lord allows Satan the free disposal not only of the elements,—the tempest, and the fire of heaven,—but also of human beings (the nomadic hordes), and at length he is permitted to smite Job with a most terrible disease. But he is obliged to obtain from God the power of effecting all this; and the limit to the injury he is allowed to inflict is set by the will of God (Job. 2: 6).

Of special significance, however, is the position of Satan with respect to the covenant people. This is shown with particular clearness in the vision of Zech. 3: 1–10, while it is also briefly alluded to in 1 Chron. 21: 1. In the vision of Zechariah, Joshua, the high priest, is the representative of the people. He is ac-

cused before the Lord, not on account of his own sins as an individual, but in his capacity of high priest. His priestly garments are defiled. Satan affirms that for this sinful people there is no valid mediation before God. But the Lord causes the high priest to be clothed in clean garments, thus acknowledging the validity of the high-priestly mediation, though with an intimation (Zech. 3: 8) that the perfect atonement for the people is to be effected only by the Messiah. Thus the work of Satan is to question the forgiveness, the justification of the church, in which sense he is called "the accuser of our brethren" (Rev. 12: 10). With respect also to his agency among men, Satan, who desires to destroy the souls of men (Job 1), forms a contrast to the "interpreting angel" (Job 33: 23), whose occupation it is to excite men to repentance and confession of sin, that their souls might be rescued from destruction.

The Satan of the Old Testament is not as yet revealed as the "prince of the world" (John 16: 11) as in the New Testament, which discloses "the deep things of Satan" (Rev. 2: 24) only along with the completion of revelation.

Of other *evil angels* nothing is distinctly taught in the Old Testament. By *Azazel* (Lev. 16) we must probably understand an evil spiritual power whom we may, with Hengstenberg, connect with the Satan of the later books (see § 140). It is true that "the destroyers" of Job 33: 22, who are contrasted with the "interpreting angels" of v. 23, must probably be referred to *angels*, but it is not so much the nature of these angels, as the Divine commission which makes them destroyers. It is only the later Jewish theology which presents us with a fully developed demonology.

[Analysis: 1) The teaching concerning Satan; 2) explanation of 2 Sam. 24: 1; 3) evil angels are instruments of Divine wrath; 4) Satan acts from a disposition hostile to man; 5) illustrated in the book of Job; 6) Satan's position with reference to Israel; 7) the vision of Zech. 3: 1—10; 8) he is our accuser; 9) his nature only clearly revealed in the N. T.; 10) Azazel; 11) the demonology of later Jewish theology.]

CHAPTER VIII.

MAN'S RELIGIOUS AND MORAL RELATION TO GOD.

§ 201. Distinction between the Ceremonial and the Moral Law.

The ceremonial and moral precepts are in the Mosaic law co-ordinate. The result of the tuition of the law which advances from the outer to the inner, is that *prophecy* carries out the distinction between the ceremonial and the moral law, and emphatically declares that the performance of the external ordinances of the law, and especially the offering of sacrifice, were, as merely outward acts, worthless; that the will of God aimed at the sanctification of the heart and the surrender of the will to God; and that the observance of the ceremonial law had no value except *as the expression of a godly disposition*. This thought forms the theme of many prophetic addresses (Hos. 6: 6; Amos 5: 21-26; Isa. 1: 11-17; Jer. 7: 21-26; Micah 6: 6-8; etc.).

There are those, however, who maintain that Ezekiel, Daniel, and Malachi, insist upon the observance of the ceremonial law. *Ezekiel* does indeed set a high value upon the external ordinances of the Mosaic law, but this is in keeping with the *priestly* character of this prophet. He does indeed describe at great length, in that famous vision recorded in Ezek. 40-48, the restoration of the Levitical ritual upon a magnificent scale in the coming times of redemption, but his very predictions of the restoration of Israel as the covenant people, show that he does not regard sanctification

as consisting in the mere externalism of the Levitical ritual.

So likewise the attempt to show that the *Book of Daniel* is opposed to the older prophetic books by its commendation of a legal externalism, is equally vain. Some pretend to see a sign of the externalism of Daniel's religion, in that, according to 6: 10, he prayed three times daily, a custom, however, alluded to as early as Ps. 55: 17. How far the Book of Daniel is from commending a righteousness of dead works, is best seen by the thoroughly penitential prayer in 9: 4-19.

It is true also that *Malachi* sternly rebukes transgressions in the matter of Divine worship, the offering of bad or defective sacrifices (1: 6-2: 9), the fraudulent withholding of the temple dues (3: 7-12), but he does so because the worldly and godless disposition of priests and people was manifested by such actions.

[Analysis: 1) Distinction between ceremonial and moral law; 2) when the ceremonial law had value; 3) the prophets lay stress upon the godly disposition; 4) Ezekiel is no exception; 5) nor does the Book of Daniel commend legal externalism; 6) much less Malachi.]

§ 202. The Ruinous Nature of Sin.

In proportion as a consciousness of the inwardness of the law's requirements is arrived at, will the *conviction of sin* become profound. Prophecy, by bringing into greater prominence the opposition in which the people stand to the electing and sanctifying purpose of their God, carries on the office of the law, and advances to the perception that the sanctification of the people at which the law aims, is unattainable during the present legal dispensation, and must, on the contrary, be effected by a *dispensation of grace*.

The tuition of the *law*, effecting a conviction of sin,

advances but gradually. We cannot expect at once to find in the Old Testament such a knowledge of sin, as is expressed in Rom. 7. But David already expressed the acknowledgment that a Divine impartation of life, a transformation of heart, was needed if the inward state was to be conformed to the Divine will (Ps. 51: 10-12; 143: 10).

To render evident that relation of electing and sanctifying love into which God has entered with His people, the prophets employ the figure of *fatherhood and sonship* (see § 82). But *the bridal and conjugal relation* is far more frequently used by them, as the symbol of the communion into which God has entered with His people, (Hosea, Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel). The nation now appears as a harlot, an adulteress. Sin is no longer mere disobedience to the commands of God, but is viewed as being in its inward and essential nature a breach of faith, as base ingratitude toward Him who has first loved. All boasting of human righteousness vanishes, and an overwhelming feeling of guilt is expressed in many prophetic discourses.

It is, first of all, *a common guilt resting upon the nation*, making the nation as such, the object of Divine wrath. From this general sinfulness, even the more religious part of the nation, the servants of God, are not so exempt as to be contrasted as absolutely righteous. The conviction thus forces itself on the mind that a *new dispensation of grace* is needed; in other words, that God must of His own free grace blot out transgression and effect by a new communication of life that conformity to His will which the law demands. The chief passages in which this is expressed are found in Jeremiah (24: 7; 31: 31-34) and Ezekiel (36: 25-29; 37: 23-27).

The fundamental assumption in this new dispensa-

tion is, as the passage from Jeremiah expresses at its close, the abolition of the old condemnation by Divine mercy; that God, as the prophet Micah says (7: 19) would of His mercy tread the iniquities of His people under foot, and cast all their sins into the depths of the sea.

It is through the pardon of sin that occasion is afforded for the agency of those purifying and sanctifying forces which God puts forth (Ezek. 36: 25-27).

[Analysis: 1) The office of the law; 2) makes slow progress; 3) symbols used by the prophets to describe the relation of Israel to God; 4) a common guilt rests upon the nation; 5) none are exempt; 6) a new dispensation of grace is needed; 7) the chief passages; 8) the fundamental principle of the new dispensation; 9) the pardon of sin.]

§ 203. The Old Testament Form of Faith.

Meanwhile the just walked in faith and had life therein. The leading of Israel, from the time of its deliverance out of Egypt, rests entirely on faith (Deut. 1: 32; 9: 23).

What then is this faith? *Negatively*, it is a ceasing from all natural confidence in one's own strength and power, a renunciation of all trust in human support and assistance (Jer. 17: 5). *Positively*, it is a fastening of the heart upon the Divine word of promise, a leaning upon the power and faithfulness of God (Ps. 112: 7, 8). On its *negative* side, whereby faith renounces self-chosen human ways, it is a resting in, a quiet waiting for God (Isa. 28: 16; 30: 15; Ps. 62: 6). On its *positive* side, it is a sanctifying of the Lord (Isa. 8: 13), a giving of glory to His sole sovereignty (Jer. 13: 16; Hab. 2: 4).

In its expectation of the fulfilment of the Divine promise, the faith of the Old Testament turns to the future. It includes *patience* and *hope* (Isa. 25: 9; Ps. 42: 5). It is according to this specially Old Testament

form that faith is illustrated by Old Testament examples in Heb. 11. But the Old Testament also exhibits faith as including *negatively* that renunciation of one's own claims and merits before God which arises from a conviction of sin, and *positively*, that surrender to the sin-annulling God and His atoning grace which are essential to the *saving faith* of the new covenant. In Ps. 130: 3-5 faith appears as a *waiting* upon the word which proclaims *forgiveness of sins*; but here, too, its eye is directed to the future. It is, however, in Isa. 40-66 that this faith is especially enforced.

[Analysis: 1) The whole history of Israel an illustration of faith; 2) the negative and positive aspects of faith; 3) the special form of O. T. faith; 4) illustrated in Heb. 11; 5) faith as described in Ps. 130: 3-5; 6) as enforced by Isaiah.]

§ 204. The Old Testament Experience of Salvation.

Was there already in Old Testament times the experience of justification and adoption in the New Testament sense of these terms? The question is whether, besides the pardon which was obtained for sins of infirmity by confession and sacrifice (Lev. 5: 10), there was also pardon for presumptuous sins, which could not be atoned for by sacrifice,—and therefore a justification of the whole man. We answer, the Old Testament certainly teaches that Divine forgiveness is imparted to the sinner who turns in penitence and faith to God; and that this is not a mere ignoring of sin (Ps. 130: 4). To this subject belongs the whole of Ps. 32.

This experience of Salvation, however, still remains but relative, and decidedly differs from that of the New Testament. 1) It indeed affords peace of mind concerning individual sins, but it does not establish *any permanent state of reconciliation*. No such atoning grace and justification were imparted to the believer

under the Old Testament as to enable him to say with the apostle: "The old things are passed away; behold, they are become new" (2 Cor. 5: 17). He was *pacified* concerning the past, but only to begin again seeking to be henceforth just through the works of the law. 2) Under the Old Testament, conversion was indeed reached as a moral change, but not regeneration as a new creation. 3) The Divine Spirit did not make in the Old Testament saints a new foundation of life, —did not as yet work outward from within, as the transforming principle of the whole man.

The highest communion between God and man, established by prophecy, does not attain to the eminence of that filial state inaugurated by the New Testament; for which reason Christ declares the greatest of the prophets to be less than the least in His kingdom (Matt. 11: 11).

[Analysis: 1) The teaching of the O. T. concerning forgiveness of sins; 2) sins of infirmity were forgiven; 3) as well as presumptuous sins; 4) the experience of salvation in the O. T. differs, however, in three things from that of the N. T; 5) it knows nothing of the filial state of the believer in Christ.]

SECTION III.
OF PROPHECY.
CHAPTER IX.

THE PROPHETIC CONSCIOUSNESS.

§ 205. Negative Propositions.

That which made the prophet a prophet was not his natural gifts, nor his own intention, and that which he proclaimed as the prophetic word was not the mere result of instruction received, nor the production of his own reflection. However true it may be that a certain learned education was given in the so-called schools of the prophets, and while it is certain that the prophets were themselves assiduous students of the law and the history of Israel, as well as of the older prophecies, still the prophet differs essentially from the later scribes and Rabbins. The prophets strictly distinguished between the word of Jehovah and their own views and desires. Very instructive in this respect is the Book of Habakkuk.

[Analysis: 1) The prophet differs from the later scribe; 2) they distinguish between their views and the prophetic word; 3) Habakkuk, a good illustration.]

§ 206. Positive Propositions.

The prophet, as such, knows himself to be the organ of Divine revelation, in virtue both of a Divine vocation, capable of being known by him as such, and which came to him with irresistible power, and also of his endowment with the enlightening, sanctifying, and

strengthening Spirit of God. Accordingly, a prophet knows the objective reality, as the Word of God, of that word which he proclaims.

1) The overwhelming constraint of the Divine call is described by *Amos* in the discourse in which he vindicates his prophetic work (Amos 3: 8). *Isaiah* (chap. 6) and *Ezekiel* (chap. 1) refer their call to visions, in which the glory of the Lord was manifested to them. But the book of *Jeremiah* furnishes the most abundant proofs of the certainty the prophets felt concerning their Divine vocation (Jer. 20: 7, 8; 17: 16). It was in virtue of the assurance that the call he had received was from God, that he condemned the pretensions of false prophets (chap. 23 and 28; see also 29: 24-32).

2) The medium of the revelation, is, however, more particularly said to be the Spirit of God, through whom it is that the Lord sends His word by means of the prophets (Zech. 7: 12). This Spirit proves itself to be Divine, *a*) by disclosing to the prophets such knowledge as could come from God alone. To lay all possible stress upon the objectivity of this word, its communication is designated as a giving (Ezek. 2: 8; 3: 3), a putting into the mouth of the prophet (Deut. 18: 18; Jer. 1: 9; etc.). *b*) But still more does the Spirit show itself to be of God to the true prophet upon whom it comes, and whom it fits for his office, by its sanctifying and strengthening agency (Micah 3: 8).

3) It is in virtue of such spiritual experience that the prophet knows that the word put into his mouth will also prove itself to bear within it the power of the living God (Jer. 23: 28, 29; Isa. 55: 11). Hence the prophet, as the announcer of this word, is also the performer of Divine *acts* (Jer. 1: 10).

[Analysis: 1) The prophet knows himself as such; 2) and knows that he has the Word of God; 3) the prophets testify to their Divine call; 4) they have the Spirit of God; 5) this proves itself divine in a two-fold manner; 6) the prophet performs divine acts.]

§ 207. Psychological Definition of the Prophetic State in Ancient Times.

How then is the prophetic state to be psychologically and more precisely defined? On this subject various opinions were held in ancient times.

At the time that the Septuagint was translated, the Greek word *mantis* designated the *ecstatic* utterer of an oracle, and *prophetes* the *sober-minded* interpreter of the oracle of the former. When, then, the Old Testament *Nabhi* is designated in the LXX by the name of *prophetes* (prophet), he may be said to be chiefly characterized not as a *predicter* (a meaning belonging indeed also to *prophetes*), but as *one who declares* what the Divine Spirit has imparted to him, to which function it is essential that it should be consciously and intelligently performed.

According to *Philo*, the prophet is the interpreter of God, who makes him inwardly perceive what he is to speak. This Divine inspiration is received by the prophet in a state of *ecstasy*, which is said indeed to be distinctly different from the frenzy of madness, but in which self-consciousness is nevertheless entirely suspended. *Philo*, however, recognizes no specific difference between prophecy and the divine illumination imparted to every sage. In both the same Spirit is working.

Philo's view of the ecstatic character of the prophetic state passed over to the earliest Church Fathers. *Athenagoras* says that the Divine Spirit that moved the prophets used them as a flute-player does his instrument. This subject was not discussed more

thoroughly until it became, as Tertullian intimates, a matter of dispute between the Montanists and the Catholic Church Fathers. The latter disgusted with ecstasy as presented to them by the Montanist prophets, declared all convulsions which repressed rational consciousness unworthy of true prophecy, and only fit for the manticism produced by demoniacal powers. So, in general, Origen (*d.* 254), Epiphanius (*d.* 403), Chrysostom (*d.* 407) and Jerome (*d.* 420). Still the polemics of the Fathers as Tholuck justly remarks, do not deny the existence of *every kind* of ecstasy in the case of the organs of revelation. They could not thus set themselves in opposition to the clear statements of Holy Scripture. They regard the prophetic state as extraordinary and temporary. Frail human nature could not endure an uninterrupted state of revelation. In this respect we discern an essential difference between the prophets and Christ, in whom the Spirit abode permanently.

[Analysis: 1) The prophetic state was variously understood in ancient times; 2) the view of the translators of the Greek Bible; 3) of Philo; 4) of the earliest Church Fathers; 5) the prophetic state is extraordinary and temporary.]

§ 208. View of this Subject in the Older Protestant Theology.

The propositions laid down by the Fathers, in opposition to the Montanists, were repeated by the older Protestant theologians. The prevailing theory of inspiration being applied to prophecy, the Protestant theologians assumed, in the case of prophets, both an entire passivity in the reception of revelation, and a continued state of rational consciousness, with at most but momentary intermissions.

In proportion, however, as the orthodox notion of inspiration became unsettled, more influence over

the form of their predictions was of course conceded to the subjectivity of the prophets. Crusius¹ made a thorough investigation of this subject. He chiefly insists upon the distinction between the matter of revelation and the form under which it is presented. With respect to the form he admits the intervention of the free agency of the organs of revelation, which makes them not passive but active instruments of God. With respect to the inspiration of the matter, Crusius distinguishes between *revelation in the narrower sense*, which produces new knowledge in man, either by a creative act or by a transformation of the knowledge already existing, and *illumination* which excites and strengthens the knowledge already existing. The distinction between apostolic and prophetic inspiration is also brought out by Crusius. The inspiration of the apostles was uninterrupted, and, depending on the continued operation of Christ and of the Holy Spirit in them, made them more like Christ. The repeated use of the formula, "Thus saith the Lord," by the prophets, shows that the state of inspiration was in their case an extraordinary one. Still even in Crusius, we meet with no exact psychological analysis of the prophetic state.

Rationalistic theology, which at best, always has seen in the prophets only so many rationalists, made no inquiry into the nature of the prophetic state. The visions which the prophets affirmed themselves to have beheld, are either attributed in a general manner to the poetic garb in which they spontaneously clothed prophetic truths, or, if recognized in a certain sense as facts, are referred to a state of violent mental excitement. Prophecy in its strictest signification is regarded as out of the question.

¹ In his *Hypomnemata ad theologiam propheticam*, 1764.

This whole subject received, however, a powerful impetus, when *Hengstenberg* (in the first edition of his *Christology*) revived in all its rigid one-sidedness the Montanist theory of prophecy. For he laid down the proposition that the prophets, when recipients of revelation, were in an extraordinary condition, essentially differing from their usual state—in an *ecstasy*, in which the intelligent consciousness retreated, and the spontaneity, being suppressed by a powerful operation of the Divine Spirit, was reduced to a state of passivity. (In the second edition of his *Christology*, Hengstenberg has essentially modified this earlier view).

[Analysis: 1) The view of the older Protestant theologians; 2) the views of Crusius; 3) he distinguishes between the matter and the form of revelation; 4) between revelation and illumination; 5) between apostolic and prophetic inspiration; 6) the view rationalistic theology always has taken; 7) the earlier view of Hengstenberg.]

§ 209. Continuity and Elevation of the Individual Life in the Prophetic State.

In the earlier view maintained by *Hengstenberg*, truth and error are blended. It is true that in prophecy states do occur in which the individual life is subjugated by the power of the Divine Spirit, but it is not true that these *coincide* with the state of prophetic revelation, nay, they are not even essential thereto.

Isaiah, in his initiatory vision (Isa. 6), is conscious that his iniquity is taken away and his sin purged, and declares himself ready in consequence to undertake the Divine commission. *Jeremiah*, too, in his inaugural vision (Jer. 1), was conscious of his weakness. It is true that *Ezekiel*, when he received the vision fell down overpowered by the sight (Ezek. 1: 28), but in order to receive the revelation he had to

stand up again, and that in the power of the Spirit who entered into him (Ezek. 2: 1, 2); and he then, evidently with complete consciousness, received the Divine word. It is true also that *Daniel* sank down stunned in consequence of a vision (Dan. 10: 8–10), but he did not receive the revelation till he had recovered himself. Besides the prophets felt themselves inwardly *elevated* (Isa. 8: 11, 12; Jer. 1: 19; etc.). In thus showing that the individual life is not obliterated but enhanced in the prophetic state, we have still left to answer the question, what the psychical form of prophecy properly is.

[Analysis: 1) The truth of Hengstenberg's view; 2) its error; 3) the prophets received revelation with complete consciousness; 4) the question to be answered].

§ 210. Prophecy an Inward Intuition.

Undoubtedly the prophets were often in a state of excited feeling at the times when they uttered their predictions, and did not, as merely mechanical instruments of the inspiring Spirit, comport themselves in an utterly indifferent manner with respect to their prophecies. But that in such cases the frame of mind was of *secondary importance*, that is, was produced by the objective influence of the Divine Spirit, is evident especially from the circumstance that the feeling natural to the prophet was frequently *exchanged* for just its opposite. Compare the prophecy concerning Moab (Isa. 16: 9–11), and that concerning Babylon (Isa. 21: 1–10), where this state of mind is very distinctly portrayed.

The psychical form of prophecy is rather that of an *inward intuition*, taking the word in its wider signification. It belongs to this intuition that the prophet is aware that the matter of revelation is directly given,

and not produced by his own agency; and this is just what the prophets affirm with respect to their prophecies. Hence the prophets designate themselves as *seers*. Sometimes this inward perception of the prophets is also styled a *hearing* (Isa. 21: 10; etc.). The prophets, however, chiefly choose the expression *to see*, even when it is a mere form of speech, for the manner in which they became directly conscious of the God-given matter (Amos 1: 1; Isa. 2: 1; Hab. 2: 1).

What now the prophet perceives is a *word of Jehovah*, an *oracle of Jehovah* (which latter expression represents the mysterious nature of the inwardly perceived Divine voice), a *massa* (a lofty or eminent saying, according to Oehler; a burden, according to Hengstenberg). When, however, the image awakened by the revelation appears in a plastic form before the mind of the prophet, a *vision* in the stricter sense takes place, and this is of a symbolical character, the matter of the prophecy being reflected in the imagination of the prophet. With respect to *visional symbolism*, there is a remarkable difference between individual prophets. In some, especially the more ancient, it is simple, and therefore for the most part easily understood, *e. g.* the visions of Amos, the devouring locusts and the consuming fire as images of the Divine judgments (Amos 7: 1-6), the plumb-line laid to the wall as symbolical of the dealings of the Divine justice (Amos 7: 7-9), the basket of ripe fruit as an image of the nation ripe for judgment (Amos 8: 1, 2). In Ezekiel, Zechariah, and Daniel, on the contrary, the symbolism is more complicated and cases occur in which the prophet himself does not understand the images he beholds, and requests an explanation of them (Zech. 4: 4; Dan. 8: 15). The prophets are, moreover, fre-

quently required to express the substance of the Divine messages by symbolical *actions*. In many of these cases, however (especially in Ezekiel), it may be questioned whether the action really took place externally as *e. g.* in Isa. 20: 2, or whether it belongs merely to vision. There is scarcely a point in prophetic theology concerning which theologians so greatly differ. No general principle can be laid down by which to determine how far such actions pertain to the province of the external or the internal.

[**Analysis:** 1) The prophets often were highly moved; 2) but the frame of mind was of secondary importance; 3) there was an inward intuition; 4) they describe themselves as *seeing*; 5) what the prophet sees; 6) a vision has a symbolical character; 7) how to interpret symbolical actions.]

§ 211. The Prophetic State Illustrated by Analogies.

If we seek from analogous occurrences in the ordinary life of the human spirit to cast some light on the nature of prophetic sight, the first which seems to offer itself for comparison is the vivid *dream*.

Although the Old Testament does not exclude the *dream* as a medium of revelation, nevertheless a subordinate importance is attributed to dreams. Although sleep, by reason of its withdrawal of a man from the external world, seems specially favorable for the intercourse of the Divine with the human spirit; still, on the other hand, a man in this condition is not *duly capable of distinguishing* between what proceeds from his own heart and Divine inspiration. The Divine Word must come to the prophets in such a manner as to leave them in no kind of doubt that it is such.

In far the greater number of cases we must evidently conceive of the state in which the prophet receives a revelation as merely one of profound self-introversion and collectedness of mind in a state of perfect

wakefulness. This prophetic state is most nearly related to *communion with God in prayer*. But the Divine Word which reached the prophet was by no means produced from the matter of the prophet's own mind, whether viewed ethically or intellectually. "A man can receive nothing except it have been given him from heaven" (John 3: 27), is the testimony of the greatest of the prophets.

[Analysis: 1) The analogy of a dream; 2) of communion with God in prayer; 3) but these analogies are misleading.]

§ 212. The Conceptions of Genius and the Natural Powers of Divination.

In explaining Old Testament prophecy, the attempt has often been made to refer it to prophetic powers inherent in the human mind, and manifesting themselves in the conceptions of genius, whether of the poet, the artist, or the hero. In particular has a *divining power*, inherent in the human mind, and producing actual prophecy *outside* the province of scriptural revelation, been spoken of. The Old Testament does indeed refer all intellectual endowment to Divine spiritual influence on the mind, but that *personal and familiar relation* in which the prophet stands to God, and in which God discloses to him secret things ("for he revealeth His secret unto His servants the prophets," Amos 3: 7), stands out as something *specific* amid these general spiritual influences. With regard to so-called natural divination, the aspect in which this may most allowably be compared with scriptural prophecy is, that it is the *prophecy of conscience*.

But does this natural divination know anything positively respecting the purpose of God's ways upon earth? The prophets of the Old Testament knew that the Spirit by which they were inspired was not the

natural spirit of their nation; that their predictions were not the expression of popular expectations,—they knew that the thoughts of God, of which they were the interpreters, were as high above the thoughts of man as heaven is higher than earth (Isa. 55: 8, 9),

The matter of revelation is not, strictly speaking, the mental *property* of the prophets, but continues to be a thing *imparted*. Hence its meaning was not fully grasped by their understanding, but was, as St. Peter tells us (1 Pet. 1: 10), a matter of investigation to themselves.

The importance of the propositions thus far developed will more clearly appear in the discussion of the nature of prophecy, to which we now proceed.

[Analysis: 1) The prophetic powers are not inherent in the human mind; 2) the O. T. knows nothing of a *natural* prophetic insight; 3) the prophecy of conscience: 4) the matter of revelation is a thing imparted; 5) importance of this preliminary discussion.]

CHAPTER X.

OF PROPHECY.

§ 213. The Office of Prophecy in General.

If we regard the collective contents of the prophetic books of the Old Testament, we must say that prophecy is employed entirely in promoting *the interest of the Kingdom of God*, and that its main office is to unfold its ways. Prophecy was designed to educate the nation to a perception of what kind of knowledge of the future could alone be a blessing to man, by opening its eyes to the holy government of God in history and to the aims of Divine providence, that thus it might learn to prepare for coming judgment.

§ 214. The Prediction of Particular Events an Essential Element of Prophecy.

According to the theory of some, the sole essential feature of Prophecy is declared to be its expression of the general ideas of the Divine government, while its prediction of particular events is, on the other hand, to be regarded as comparatively unessential and subordinate; nay, the very admissibility of prediction is denied by the *rationalistic* party, on the ground of its destroying human freedom and interfering with history.

The question which concerns us here is whether prophecy does or does not attribute to itself as essential the characteristic of predicting particular events? In answer it is sufficient to bring forward, besides the

fundamental passage Deut. 18: 22, the very decided expressions contained on this subject in Isa. 40 and following chapters. Here we find the greatest emphasis laid upon the circumstances that the deliverance of Israel from the Babylonian captivity had been long predicted by prophecy, and that the prophet now speaking foretells the appearance of Cyrus before it takes place. It maintains also that the prediction of such particular events is a proof that the God of Israel is the true God, while on the other hand it asserts that the vanity of the heathen gods is manifested by their inability to foretell anything (Isa. 41: 21-28; 42: 9). In this last passage, "new things do I declare: before they spring forth I tell you of them" (42: 9), the idea of pure prediction could hardly be more precisely expressed (compare also Isa. 43: 9-13; 44: 25-28; 45: 21).

[Analysis: 1) The theory held by some; 2) prediction is an essential element of prophecy; 3) the teaching of Deut. 18: 22; 4) of Isaiah.]

§ 215. The Peculiarities of Old Testament Prophecy.

The matter of revelation being given to the prophets in the form of intuition, the future appeared to them as immediately present, complete, or at all events in progress. How great soever the distance, according to human computation, of the things predicted, they are actually in train to the prophetic eye, and all that intervenes can only help to hasten their fulfilment (Hab. 2: 3). What the prophet sees are simply "the things which must shortly come to pass" (Rev. 1: 1); for in the invisible world which is disclosed to the prophet, all is active, in motion, about to approach.

Connected with this peculiarity of prophecy is the

circumstance that it gives for the most part only a subordinated importance to dates. Sometimes the dates given have evidently a *symbolical* meaning, and must not for this reason be pressed to the very letter. In general, the word of the Lord, "It is not for you to know times or seasons, which the Father hath set within His own authority" (Acts 1: 7), applies also to the prophets, who limit themselves to indefinite dates, such as "in that day", "after this", etc. The grouping of that which is predicted according to the necessary sequences of its essential elements takes the place of chronological statements. The Old Testament prophecy is always directed to the consummation of the Kingdom of God, and announces the ways in which God conducts His purpose of salvation, from the actual present to its appointed end. In other words, what takes place "at the end of the days," *i. e.* at the close of this dispensation, forms the boundary of the prophetic horizon. This "end", in prophetic diction is the time of the consummation of redemption (Hos. 3: 5; Jer. 48: 47; Ezek. 38: 16). The event next preceding this "end" is judgment, and indeed judgment both upon the rebellious people of God and the sinful world. Thus the matter of prophecy may be defined by its three elements,—*guilt, judgment*, (first upon the house of God, then upon the world), *redemption*. The progress of the kingdom of God forms itself in prophetic vision, into a picture in which judgment generally forms the foreground and redemption the background. Thus prophecy beholds in every event the coming of the Judge and Saviour of the world to set up His kingdom. In this combination of the nearer and more distant future, lies what has been called the *perspective* character of prophecy. Bengel aptly designates

this characteristic when in his Gnomon on Matt. 24: 29, he says: "A prophecy resembles a landscape painting, which marks distinctly the houses, paths, and bridges in the fore-ground, but brings together, into a narrow space, the distant valleys and mountains, though they are really far apart." This characteristic of prophecy is manifested with especial beauty in the Book of Isaiah (40—66). To the prophets themselves, moreover, the time when their predictions should be fulfilled was, as we are told, a subject of investigation (1 Pet. 1: 11).

The fact that the matter of prophecy is given in the form of such an intuition, also furnishes the reason why it always sees the realization of that matter in particular events which are complete in themselves. In the *fulfilment*, on the contrary, that which is but momentary in the prophetic intuition is accomplished by a process of long and gradual development; and when a prediction attains its first stage of fulfilment, there opens out from the standpoint of subsequent prophets, a new perspective toward the consummation of judgment and redemption. Hence it is that many expositors speak of a two, a three, or even a fourfold fulfilment.

[Analysis: 1) To the prophet the future appears immediately present; 2) all is in motion, about to happen; 3) no great stress is laid on dates; 4) what takes the place of chronological statements; 5) O. T. prophecy always directed to the final consummation; 6) what is meant by this end; 7) that which precedes the end; 8) the three elements of the matter of prophecy; 9) the perspective character of prophecy; 10) illustrated by Isa. 40—66; 11) prophecy always sees its realization in single, complete events; 12) the fulfilment may take place by stages.]

§ 216. Prophecy and Fulfilment.

Since the matter of prophecy presents itself to view as a multitude of individual facts, it may sometimes

appear as though single predictions contradicted each other, when they are in fact only those parts into which the ideas revealed have been separated, mutually completing each other. Thus the representation of the Messiah is at one time that of a general Prince of Peace, at another that of a powerful and warlike hero who overthrows his enemies; on the one side a successful ruler, on the other the servant of God who atones for the sins of the people by undergoing death. The internal harmony of the two views—that Christ is our peace and at the same time one who has come to send a sword, that the kingdom of God is at once a contending and a peaceful kingdom—is first found in the New Testament.

The matter of prophecy being given to the prophets in the form of intuition, it is brought down, so far as its form is concerned, to the plane of the beholder himself; hence prophecy is affected by the limits of the sphere of Old Testament life, the special relations of the age, and the individual peculiarity of the prophet. The future kingdom of God is beheld by the prophets as being in all essential matters an extended and glorified form of the Old Testament theocracy. The admission of the nations into this kingdom is their traveling to Mount Zion (Isa. 2), etc. One may often feel, when reading the prophetic word, how much further the spiritual meaning reaches than the letter expresses; how prophecy struggles, as it were, to give its thoughts an adequate embodiment. Compare such descriptions as Zech. 2 and similar passages. In virtue of the organic connection existing between the two Testaments, revelation brings forth in the New Testament, circumstances, conditions and facts, which are analogous, even with respect to their external form, to their pre-

representation in the Old. And this is to say that the Old Testament form with which the matter of prophecy is covered, is *typical* of the form of the New Testament fulfilment, and that the coincidence of the two may extend to individual features. This we see in the prophetic delineation (Isa. 53) of the Servant of the Lord atoning by His death for the sins of the people, and afterward glorified. For this reason it would ill become an expositor to attempt to determine beforehand how far the last form of the kingdom of God is to coincide with the prophetic description of the last things.

Finally, in forming a correct judgment of the relation between prophecy and fulfilment, the point yet remains to be considered, that God in His revelation placed Himself in an historical relation with mankind, and the kingdom of God therefore advancing, not by a process of nature, but as a moral institution, the fulfilment of prophecy is not placed outside the sphere of human freedom, although the Divine counsel cannot in the end fail to come to pass in spite of all opposition. The teachings of prophecy, like the law, subserve an *educational* purpose, by making disclosures concerning the future to man for his good. The Old Testament declares as clearly as possible, that not every predicted judgment must of necessity be inflicted in the manner spoken; that the Divine threatening leaves man for a long time space for repentance (Jer. 18: 1—10). In the non-fulfilment, however, of His threats and promises, God acts not arbitrarily, but according to a law of righteous retribution. This doctrine forms, as is obvious, one of the fundamental thoughts of the Book of Jonah (3: 3—10). There is, however, a *limit* to the respites granted by God's long-

suffering. So, too, when *blessings* are predicted, the fulfilment of such predictions depends upon moral causes, viz., upon the obedient submission of the people to the Divine will, while, nevertheless this fulfilment cannot be rendered doubtful by any obstacles which man can oppose to it. The question here arises, is the *consummation* of redemption possible while Israel is, as a nation, in a state of rejection? The Old Testament returns an absolute negative to this question. It speaks only of a temporary rejection, which, moreover, takes place in such wise that Israel does not perish as a nation, but is preserved for future restoration. Was then this law abolished when Israel rejected the gracious visitation of their Messiah, when the kingdom of God was taken away from them and given to a nation bringing forth the fruits thereof (Matt. 21: 43)? The New Testament also answers this question in the negative (Rom. 11: 25, 26).

[Analysis: 1) Solution of the apparent contradictions of prophecy; 2) illustrated by the prophecies concerning the Messiah; 3) prophecy is affected by the limits and the sphere of the O. T.; 4) the Spiritual meaning deeper than its form of expression; 5) the O. T. form is typical of the form of the N. T. fulfilment; 6) illustrated by Isa. 53; 7) the fulfilment of prophecy not placed outside the sphere of human freedom; 8) prophecy subserves an educational purpose; 9) the lesson of Jonah 3: 3—10; 10) Israel and the consummation.]

SECTION IV.

OF THE KINGDOM OF GOD.

§ 217. Survey.

The chief elements in the process of the development of the kingdom of God now come under consideration. Sinful Israel belied its blessed vocation. God's holiness obliges Him to do away with this contradiction. The means by which He effects this end is the infliction of judgment. The attribute, in virtue of which God thus determines the progress of His kingdom on earth by judgment and deliverance is *His righteousness*

CHAPTER XI.

THE PURPOSE OF THE KINGDOM OF GOD.

§ 218. The Design of God's Kingdom.

The idea of God's purpose in setting up a kingdom includes the following elements:

1) *Jehovah* as the Creator and Lord of the world is in Himself the *God of all nations*; but,

2) He is *not yet* God to all nations, and is only manifest as God to Israel, His chosen people;

3) By *means of Israel*, however, He is to be universally known and acknowledged; as He is now the king of His own people, His kingdom is to be set up among all the nations of the world by their means.

Of these elements, the first two, are clearly contained in the Pentateuch (Ex. 19: 5, 6). Nor is the third

element absent from the Pentateuch (Gen. 9: 27, the prophetic words of Noah; Gen. 12: 3; 18: 18; 22: 18; 26: 4; 28: 14, the promise to Abraham, "in thee shall all the families of the earth be blessed"). But this last thought falls into the background at the period of the foundation of the theocracy. The future admission of the Gentiles into the kingdom of God is first brought into full light by *prophecy*. In the older prophets, indeed, the political horizon is still very limited, including at first only the neighboring nations; but when Israel appeared on a wider historical stage, prophecy clearly and completely recognized that government of the God of Israel which embraces all nations, determines their history, and directs all their ways toward the accomplishment of His own purposes. The purpose, however, of all this intervention of God in the heathen world is expressed,—“that unto me every knee shall bow; every tongue swear” (Isa. 45: 23). The *Book of Daniel*, in particular, portrays in magnificent touches the universality of the Divine kingdom: “God changeth the times and the seasons; he removeth kings, and setteth up kings” (Dan. 2: 21). The kingdoms of the world which are from beneath have run their course according to this appointment (Dan 2 and 7), that the kingdom of God which is to come from above, and which all must serve (Dan 7: 14), may be set up in its eternal power and glory.

[Analysis: 1) The design of God's kingdom includes three elements; 2) these thoughts already expressed in the Pentateuch; 3) the admission of the Gentiles first brought into full light by prophecy; 4) the teaching of the older prophets; 5) of the Book of Daniel.]

§ 219. The Relation of the Present to the Purpose of the Divine Kingdom.

What, then, it may be asked, is the relation of the *present* to the purpose of God's kingdom? Israel and the nations of the world are in a state of contradiction thereto. Israel, which was to be the means of converting the heathen to God, had become even worse than the heathen (Ezek: 5: 5-10). In what relation, then, do the *heathen* stand to the kingdom of God? The heathen are under the Divine displeasure *not* on account of *their not being Jews*, but on account of their idolatry, the folly and worthlessness of which they might readily have perceived (Isa. 44: 9; Jer. 10: 8-10; Ps. 115: 4-8; etc.). That, however, which properly exposes the heathen to the judgments proceeding from the God of Israel, is their *enmity toward the covenant people*.

[Analysis: 1) Israel, on account of idolatry, was not fulfilling its mission; 2) the reason the heathen are under Divine displeasure.]

§ 220. The Judgment upon the Covenant People.

"God the Holy one sanctifies Himself in righteousness" (Isa. 5: 16), by sending destructive judgments upon all that opposes His purpose of redemption, and thus insuring the triumph of His kingdom. The usual designation of this final theocratic judgment is "the day of Jehovah" (Joel 1: 15; Zeph. 1: 7); "the day of Jehovah's anger" (Zeph. 2: 3); "the great and terrible day of Jehovah" (Mal. 4: 5). The features by which the prophets portray this day, the manner in which they describe it as announced and accompanied by terrible natural phenomena (Joel 2: 30, 31; Isa. 13: 9, 10; Zeph. 1: 15, 16), are not to be regarded as merely poetic coloring, but rest upon the scriptural view of the

inalienable connection between the course of nature and the progress of the Divine kingdom.

There is a close connection between the judgments on the covenant people and the judgments on the heathen world. They seem to stand in immediate connection in the great picture of judgment in Zephaniah (chapters 1 and 2). More strictly speaking, however, the relation of the two judgments to each other is, that the *judgment of Israel in point of time precedes*, that of the nations of the world, follows. Judgment must first begin at the house of God, as the apostle Peter expresses it (1 Pet. 4: 17). And Ezekiel, in the majestic vision recorded in Ezek. 9, sees judgment beginning at the sanctuary and those who are called to be its guardians.

There is also a *historical progress* observable in the announcement of judgment upon the covenant people. In the Book of Joel *Judah* is to incur only a visitation which leads the people to repentance. In *Amos*, the judgments to be inflicted upon the *ten tribes* occupy the foreground. And after the catastrophe of Samaria fails to have the effect of leading Judah to repentance, prophecy announces henceforth the ruin of the kingdom of Judah, the destruction of the temple, the desolation of the land, and the captivity of the people, the locality of which is first designated as Babylon in Micah 4: 10; Isa. 39: 6, 7. Judgment being the abrogation of the covenant relation between God and His people, it was inflicted in the form of expulsion from the Holy Land, and the abolition of the temple worship. Israel was to abide many days without king, and without prince, and without sacrifice (Hos. 3: 4), and to eat polluted bread among the heathen (Hos. 9: 4).

[Analysis: 1) The day of judgment shall come; 2) the features of the Day of the Lord; 3) description as given by the prophets; 4) the judgment on Israel precedes that upon the heathen world; 5) meaning of 1 Pet. 4: 17; 6) teaching of Ezek. 9; 7) a progress in the revelation of the coming of this judgment; 8) the meaning of Hos. 3: 4.]

§ 221. The Judgment upon the Heathen Nations.

The judgment inflicted upon His covenant people is held up by the Lord as a warning to the *heathen* (Jer. 25: 29–38; Isa. 10: 5–15; Obad. 15–16). The view of the several prophets concerning the judgments upon the heathen world is fashioned according to the historical perspective imposed upon each by contemporary events. The earliest description is found in Joel 3. While then Amos, whose opening sentence (Amos 1: 2) connects his prophecy with Joel 3: 16, divides this general judgment into many acts of national judgment, Isaiah again (Isa. 24–27) sets before us a representation of a general judgment of the world, without any definite historical connection, except that a return from Assyrian captivity is spoken of (Isa. 27: 13). On the other hand, prophecy, even in the Assyrian period, points onward beyond Assyria to *Babylon*. In Jeremiah the series of announcements of judgments upon the nations closes with the magnificent prediction of the fall of Babylon (Jer. 50 and 51).

The fall of Babylon is not, however, contemporaneous with the end of this dispensation, and accordingly the history of the world goes on, and with it the judgment of the world still proceeds. Here we have that remarkable prophecy of Ezekiel (Ezek. 38 and 39) concerning Gog and Magog, which prediction is made use of in the description of the last conflict against the Holy City (Rev. 20: 8). This prediction of judgment is then taken up by the *post-Babylonian*

prophets. The passages in Zechariah (Zech. 12—14), especially chapter 14, are still more closely connected with the prophecy of Ezekiel concerning Gog, and at the same time carry on still further that of Joel. When things have come to the worst, Jehovah appears with all His saints upon the Mount of Olives for the deliverance of His people. This day of decision is a day of terrible darkness; but after the enemies, panic-stricken by God, have now also helped to exterminate each other, the light of redemption shall dawn on the evening of this last day of the present dispensation. Here again the thought is impressed that the church will have to endure not merely a judicial sifting like that announced by Malachi (3:2, 18), but an extremity of tribulation, in which it will seem to have perished.

We close this survey of Old Testament prophecy concerning the judgment of the world, with Daniel's prophecy of the four kingdoms. According to Dan 2 and 7, the history of the world is to run its course in four kingdoms. This worldly power is destroyed at a blow by the kingdom of God coming from heaven. We cannot here more particularly discuss these four kingdoms. It will always be a matter of dispute whether to adopt the traditional interpretation, still advocated by Hengstenberg, Hofmann and others, which makes these kingdoms to embrace the Babylonian (Chaldean), Medo-Persian, Grecian (Græco-Macedonian), and Roman empires, or the now more usual one (of Delitzsch among others), which makes the fourth kingdom the Grecian, and explains the others variously,—mostly, however, regarding the second as the Median, the third as the Persian. Of special importance, however, is that feature in this delineation of judgment, which represents the arro-

gance of the secular power, and its hostility to the kingdom of God as at last concentrated in a king, who, with a mouth speaking great things, blasphemes the Most High, and proceeds to destroy His worship and exterminate His saints; who then for a period obtains power over the saints of the Most High, until the final judgment takes place and involves him in destruction (Dan. 7: 8, 11, 20, 21, 25, 26). That evil too, will inwardly come to maturity before the final judgment, is the thought which is here more distinctly expressed than before. Dan. 11: 6 sees a preliminary embodiment of this view in Antiochus Epiphanes; and thus the Maccabean persecution, which contributed to the purification of the people, becomes a type of the last tribulation of the Church (Dan. 12: 1), which shall be such as never was since there was a nation, but which shall conduce to the purification and preservation of the Church (Dan. 12: 10).

[**Analysis.** 1) The teaching of Jer. 25: 29—38; 2) of Joel; 3) of Isaiah; 4) of Jeremiah; 5) the fall of Assyria; 6) of Babylon; 7) the prophecy of Ezek. 38 and 39; 8) of Zech. 12—14; 9) the great lessons to be drawn; 10) the four kingdoms of Daniel; 11) exposition of Dan. 7; 12) meaning of Dan. 11: 6; 13) of Dan. 12: 1, 10.]

CHAPTER XII.

THE DELIVERANCE AND RESTORATION OF THE COVENANT PEOPLE.

§ 222. The Restoration of Israel a Necessary Event.

The future redemption is represented as embracing:

1) The deliverance and restoration of the rejected covenant people in which even the just who have fallen asleep are to participate by the resurrection.

2) The introduction of those heathen who have been saved from judgment into the kingdom of God by means of the restored covenant people.

3) The prophecies concerning redemption culminate in the appearance of the Messiah.

The restoration of Israel is not founded upon any claim that can be advanced by this people, but solely upon the nature of their God as the Holy and Faithful One. As Jehovah, He is the *Faithful One*, whose words of promise, given to the fathers of the nation who found favor in His sight, shall stand forever, while all that is earthly shall perish (Isa. 40: 7, 8). His faithfulness cannot be made void by the unfaithfulness of man. Nay, the Divine judgment of rejection is to have the effect of causing the whole power of the Divine love to shine forth (Jer. 31: 20; Isa. 49: 14, 15; 54: 7-10). *But how does this love deliver?* The answer is, 1) God so arranges that a restoration of this nation is possible; and 2) He so restores the nation as to make it a fit instrument for the accomplishment of His purposes of redemption.

[**Analysis:** 1) The future redemption embraces three things; 2) the ground of the restoration of Israel; 3) the unfaithfulness of man cannot make of none effect the faithfulness of God (Rom. 3: 3); 4) the manner in which the love of God delivers Israel.]

§ 223. The New Covenant an Everlasting One.

1. God's judgments have a purpose, and therefore a measure, as taught by Isaiah in his profound parable (Isa. 28: 24–29). According to this measure, judgment is so inflicted upon Israel that they are preserved therein. And here we meet with the important prophetic doctrine of *the remnant of Jacob*. In these faithful ones, this *ecclesia invisibilis* of the old covenant, we have a pledge that the people of God shall not perish. The intercession of these servants of God procures a longer exemption from judgment for the people (Amos 7: 1–6). For the sake of this seed of His servants, God will not exterminate Israel (Isa. 65: 8–10). This remnant of Jacob, Isaiah declares, shall return to the mighty God (Isa. 10: 21).

2. In this restored remnant, the stock of the new Church, the Divine counsel is to attain its end, and that forever. The *new covenant is everlasting* (Hos. 2: 19; Jer. 31: 35–37). In the new covenant, God does not merely demand, but effects that nature in His people, in virtue of which they are now fitted for their vocation. This restoration of the people does not indeed take place in a magical manner; it becomes possible on their part through deep *repentance* for former sins, and a zealous return to their God. Hence it is that, when the Divine summons penetrates the lands of their captivity, the rejected ones hasten with trembling, lest their deliverance should be delayed (Hos. 11: 10, 11), and return with weeping and supplications (Jer. 31: 9). The Divine *forgiveness* corresponds with

the repentance of the people, and is complete. The fact that God thus restores the people to the same relation to Himself, is *their righteousness from Him* (Isa. 54: 17). But this righteousness of grace, which thus abolishes sin, becomes also a *righteousness of life*, a new vital principle being implanted in the church by the outpouring of the Divine Spirit. The new church is a *spiritual* church (Isa. 59: 21; Ezek. 39: 29). But such guidance was effected only by an indwelling of the Holy Spirit, and even in the prophets this influence was an extraordinary endowment. The church of the future, on the contrary, is founded upon an outpouring of the Spirit upon all flesh (Joel 2: 28, 29). No age or station is excluded from the possession of the Spirit. With this agree also the passages in Jer. 31: 34; Isa. 54: 13. This is confirmed by John 6: 45; 1 John 2: 20, 27, which again take up these prophetic utterances. But these passages are not intended to do away with human means for obtaining a knowledge of saving truth, but to proclaim the *independence of human authority* enjoined by each member of the church with respect to his *assurance of salvation*. They promise that Divine truth shall be directly testified to by the Holy Spirit in each member of this church. This impartation of the Holy Spirit, besides communicating a vital knowledge of God, purifies the heart and creates a readiness to fulfil the Divine will (Ezek. 36: 25–27; Jer. 31: 33). And thus the end of the Old Testament educational work is attained; the holy people of God is also a subjectively holy church.

[Analysis: 1) The lesson taught by Isa. 28: 24–29; 2) the doctrine of the remnant of Jacob; 3) the meaning of Jer. 31: 35–37; 4) this restoration rests on certain conditions; 5) a distinction already drawn between a righteousness of grace and of life; 6) both given by the Spirit; 7) difference between the working of the Spirit in the O. and N. T.; 8) the assurance of salvation; 9) the meaning of Ezek. 36: 25–27 and Jer. 31: 33.]

§ 224. Other Features of the Times of Redemption.

The other features of the times of redemption are, according to prophetic intuition, the following:

1. The return of the people to the Holy Land, and the restoration of Jerusalem. The possession of the Holy Land is declared to be a perpetual one, from Joel 3: 20 and Amos 9: 15 onward, with increase of territory (Obadiah 17: 21).

2. The reunion of the twelve tribes. This point is most fully treated in the prophecy of Ezekiel (37: 15–28).

3. By reason of the causal connection between sin and evil, the restoration of the people being a deliverance from sin, is at the same time the abolition of evil in all respects—an abolition of all the troubles of life; the sanctification of the inner life effected by the Holy Spirit was to press outward, and manifest itself in a perfect purification and consecration of even the most ordinary affairs of life.

Zechariah (14: 20, 21) expresses the thought that holiness is to penetrate even to that which is most external. Among the troubles of life so frequently summed up in the Old Testament as the four chief evils (the sword, famine, wild beasts, and pestilence) which shall be abolished, *war* is especially mentioned. All weapons are to be destroyed (Isa. 2: 4; Zech. 9: 10); the new church is unapproachable in its protected retirement (Mic. 7: 14); the new city of God is no more to be desecrated by enemies (Joel 3: 17). Peace is also to pervade *nature*. Every blessing of heaven and earth is to be poured out upon the favored people; all that can harm them is to be done away with (Hos. 2: 18; Amos 9: 13–15; Ezek. 34: 25–31). The nature of the

wild beasts is to be changed (Isa. 11: 6–9). This description must not be regarded, as by some, as mere allegory. But in all these pictures of the days of redemption we always perceive that such external renovation presupposes deliverance from sin and inward renewal.

[Analysis: 1) Three other features of the times of redemption; 2) the return to the Holy Land, as taught by the prophets; 3) meaning of Ezek. 37: 15–28; 4) of Zech. 14: 20, 21; 5) the four chief evils named in the O. T. shall be abolished; 6) exposition of Amos 9: 13–15; 7) of Ezek. 34: 25–31; 8) of Isa. 11: 6–9.]

§ 225. Death Destroyed.

The last enemy that shall be destroyed is death, in which the penalty inflicted to mankind for sin culminates. The voice of weeping shall be no more heard in the new Jerusalem (Isa. 65: 19). Yet in this very passage (verses 20–23), human life is only supposed to be of greater length, perhaps such as Genesis ascribes to primeval time. Here, then, a limitation of the power of death is spoken of, and also sin is still represented as possible. On the other hand, prophecy rises in some passages to a declaration of the annihilation of death, and of a resurrection of the dead. The ultimate grounds on which the prophetic doctrine of the resurrection rests, are:

1) The knowledge of the *living God*, who has power even over death and the regions of the dead (Deut. 32: 39; 1 Sam. 2: 6).

2) The importance of *human personality*, which is called to communion with God.

Still it is not of the vanishing of death in the cases of individuals that prophecy chiefly treats, but of the eternal duration of the Church. This is guaranteed by the eternity of God, who is an inexhaustible source

of life even to His perishing people (Isa. 40: 28–31). When the heavens wax old as doth a garment, and are changed as a vesture, He remains *the same*, and therefore the seed of His servants shall outlast these changes of the universe (Ps. 102: 27, 28). And this very fact that the Church rises again in renewed vigor after apparent destruction, is also represented as her resurrection from death (Hos. 6: 2; 13: 14). The last verse (Hos. 13: 14) points significantly to an actual conquest of death and the region of the dead; hence its citation in 1 Cor. 15: 55.

[Analysis: 1) The meaning of Isa. 65: 19–23; 2) the ultimate grounds of the resurrection; 3) the teaching of Isa. 40: 28–31; 4) of Hos. 6: 2; 5) of Hos. 13: 14.]

§ 226. The Resurrection.

In Isa. 25: 8, the prophet speaking of the times of redemption, declares that the Lord would forever annihilate death and wipe away tears from all faces. This implied, in the first place, only the abolition of death for the church of that period; but in Isa. 26: 19 the prophecy goes further. On the day of the final judgment for which the Lord rises (Isa. 26: 21), the earth discloses her blood, and no more covers her slain; these, according to the most probable explanation, being awakened to new life, obtain their justification. Advancing to still later prophecy we first meet with Ezekiel's vision of dry bones (Ezek. 37). From the times of the Church Fathers to the most recent expositors, it has been disputed whether the description in Ezek. 37: 1–10 is to be understood literally of the resurrection of the dead, or symbolically of the restoration of the covenant people. After the almost exclusive adoption^{*} of the symbolical meaning in recent times, Hitzig and Kliefoth have again re-

vived the literal interpretation. In any case, however, the vision is of the greatest importance in the development of the doctrine of the resurrection, which, though not resulting therefrom as its direct application, is yet implied by its obvious application. The resurrection of the dead is, however, decidedly taught in Dan. 12: 2, 13. According to the connection of Dan. 12: 2 with Dan 11: 33, 35, the promise of a resurrection to life (Isa. 26: 19) is made especially with reference to those who have maintained their fidelity to God by a confessor's death. The expression "many", however, must not be taken in a partial sense. It is not used in opposition to those who do not rise, but merely as expressing a great number. The resurrection of the *ungodly* first appears in Daniel (12: 2), though the transition to it is formed by Isa. 66: 24. Daniel is speaking only of a resurrection of Israel, not of that of *all* men; the latter not being expressly mentioned in the Old Testament, though an allusion to it may be found in Isa. 24: 22.

[Analysis: 1) The teaching of Isa. 25: 8; 2) of Isa. 26: 19; 3) of Isa. 26: 21; 4) of Ezek. 37: 1—10; 5) of Dan. 12: 2, 13; 6) the resurrection of the ungodly; 7) of all men.]

CHAPTER XIII.

THE ADMISSION OF THE HEATHEN INTO THE KINGDOM OF GOD.

§ 227. The Extension of the Kingdom of God in the Times of Redemption.

The opposition of the heathen world to the divinely purposed kingdom of God, is subdued by the destructive judgment inflicted on it. But this judgment is to have also a positive result. As, however, Israel is to be restored only in its sifted remnant, so also is only the *remnant* of the heathen, who do homage to the Lord, rescued from judgment (Zech. 14: 16). To the intuition of the older prophets, this enlargement of the kingdom of God by the admission of the heathen is first of all an extension of the theocracy as it existed under David and Solomon, when heathen nations were subject to the sceptre of the theocratic king (Amos 9: 11, 12). On the other hand, we are placed upon the heights of prophetic intuition in the descriptions of the latter days given in Isa. 2: 2-4, and Mic. 4: 1-4. All nations are going to Zion, which is spiritually elevated above all the mountains of the world, to receive there the Divine law as the rule of their lives, while universal peace prevails under the rule of Jehovah. But it is especially in the Book of Isaiah (40-66) that the mission of Israel as the servant of the Lord, to be the medium of revelation to all mankind, forms one of the fundamental thoughts.

In this consummation of redemption, the theocratic

relation in which Jehovah in Old Testament times stood to Israel, is transferred to all mankind. The Lord has become the *King* of all nations (Zech. 14: 16, 17; Isa. 24: 23; etc.). All the treasures of the world, all the most precious possessions of the Gentiles, now conduce to the glory of the Divine kingdom, and are used for the adornment of the city and temple of God (Isa. 60: 9–11; Hag. 2: 7).

[Analysis: 1) The teaching of Zech. 14: 16; 2) of Amos 9: 11, 12; 3) of Isa. 2: 2–4; 4) of Mic. 4: 1–4; 5) of Isa. 40–66; 6) of Isa. 60: 9–11; 7) of Hag. 2: 7.]

§ 228. The Conditions under which the Heathen are admitted into the Kingdom of God.

The coming of this kingdom of God which embraces all nations, is, however, combined, according to prophetic intuition, with the fact that Israel is to remain the mediatory nation at the head of the nations, and Jerusalem with its temple to form the central point of the kingdom to which the nations are to journey. The incorporation of the heathen into the kingdom of God is in Ps. 87 represented as their acquisition of rights of citizenship in Jerusalem, to which also the passage in Isa. 56: 3–7 refers. Prophecy does not contemplate the abolition of sacrifice in the coming period of salvation, for the rites of worship in this future and enlarged kingdom of God are connected in respect to sacrifice and festival, with the Old Testament ritual. See especially Isa. 56: 7; 66: 23; Zech. 14: 16–19. On the other hand there is no lack of prophetic passages in which the limitations of the Old Testament ritual are broken through. We would here notice two remarkable prophetic passages in which the connection with the place of worship in Jerusalem is effaced. 1) Mal. 1:

11, a passage quoted times without number by the Fathers, and falsely claimed by Roman Catholic theologians as the chief passage in favor of the sacrifice of the mass. Here Malachi, referring to the time when the Lord shall be manifested to the Gentiles, predicts a sacrificial service among all nations in all parts of the world. 2) Side by side with this may be placed the noted prophecy concerning Egypt in Isa. 19, which speaks of worship of Jehovah instituted not by Israelites but by Egyptians, and indeed in the land of Egypt. Thus did the spirit of prophecy struggle to overcome particularism by exhibiting the Divine purpose concerning the kingdom of God. Oehler gives us no hint as to the manner in which these prophecies pertaining to sacrifice and temple worship should be interpreted, whether literally, or typically and metaphorically. A *literal* interpretation is scarcely possible, for as the apostles described in the words of this world the things of the world to come, so the prophets depicted the spiritual kingdom of Christ in words taken from earthly things connected with the state of the Church under the Old Testament, and which, therefore, are to be explained typically.

[Analysis: 1) The part Israel is to take in the admission of Gentiles into the kingdom; 2) the teaching of Ps. 87; 3) of Isa. 56: 3—7; 4) of Zech. 14: 16—19; 5) of Mal. 1: 11; 6) of Ezek. 19; 7) the manner in which this worship is to be interpreted.]

CHAPTER XIV.

THE MESSIAH.

§ 229. The Messianic Hope.

The consummation of redemption is according to prophetic intuition, introduced on the one hand by the personal coming of Jehovah in His glory, but on the other by the coming of a king of the race of David, the Messiah. The former view prevails in a great number of passages. The two views are placed in juxtaposition in Ezek. 34. The Lord here declares Himself against the unfaithful shepherds of His people, who have suffered them to perish. He will, it is at first said in verses 11–15, *Himself* feed His sheep. But then the prophecy turns directly in verse 23 to the other view: “I will set up one shepherd over them, even my servant David; he shall feed them, and he shall be their shepherd.” Then in verse 24 the two views are connected: “And I the Lord will be their God, and my servant David prince among them.”

Now this son of David in whom Old Testament prophecy culminates is the *Messiah*. The word *Mashiahh* (*Christos*, *anointed*) is used in the Old Testament first as the designation of every one anointed with the holy anointing oil, but especially is “The Lord’s anointed” the title of the theocratic king; and on this account it became, chiefly by reason of the passages Ps. 2: 2, Dan. 9: 25, the proper name of the descendant of David who was to achieve complete redemption, and bring to its consummation the kingdom of God. ✓

The Messianic hope had already struck root in a series of passages in the *Pentateuch*, and here come under consideration the passages in Gen 3: 15; 12: 3; 18: 18; 22: 18; 26: 4; 28: 14; 49: 10; Num. 24: 17, 18; Deut. 18; 15-19.

[Analysis: 1) The two views of the consummation of redemption as presented in the O. T.; 2) exposition of Ezek. 34; 3) the word *Messiah*; 4) the doctrine of the Messiah in the Pentateuch.]

§ 230. The Promise, 2 Sam. 7, as the Foundation of the Messianic Idea in its stricter Sense. The Messianic Psalms.

2 Sam. 7 forms in a twofold respect the starting-point for the more definite form of the Messianic idea,—1) by the fact that the consummation of the kingdom of God for which Israel was chosen, is from this time forward connected with a *king* who, as the son of God, *i. e.* the representative of Jehovah, and, fitted by Him to be the depositary of the Divine sovereignty on earth,—stands in a relation of most intimate connection with God; and 2) in that it is established for all time that this king is to be a *son of David*. How glorious the view of the Davidic kingdom is rendered by the promise in 2 Sam. 7, is first shown by the last song of David (2 Sam. 23). But sacred poetry, under the impulse of the Spirit, now creates a kingly image, in which all that the present manifests is far surpassed, and the kingship of David and Solomon beheld in typical perfection. This leads us to the *Messianic Psalms*¹ (2, 45, 72, 110), with respect to which *three different views* have at all times existed. 1) Some refer these Psalms to some actual Israelite king; but since they *idealize* his government, and thus transfer

¹ Among the prophetic and typical Psalms we may place Pss. 2, 16, 22, 24, 31, 35, 40, 41, 45, 50, 55, 68, 69, 72, 78, 87, 88, 102, 105, 106, 109, 110, 118, 132, 135, 136.

to him predicates (such as the right to universal sovereignty, Ps. 2: 2, and the union of an everlasting priesthood with his kingship, Ps. 110), which cannot find in him their full historical accomplishment, they *typically* point to the future realizer of the theocratic kingship. 2) Others maintain that the psalmist, filled with the idea of the theocratic kingship, really rises in these psalms to the view of an individual in whom this *idea is perfectly realized*, and hence, according to the mind of the spirit, is speaking of the coming Messiah. 3) Others again distinguish between the original signification of these psalms, by which they refer to an historical king, and the *use* which, as prophetic and Messianic songs of praise, they *subsequently* acquired in Divine worship.

Oehler holds that the third view is especially applicable to Ps. 45, but grants that the directly Messianic interpretation is fully borne out in Pss. 2, 72, and 110. ✓

[Analysis: 1) The Messianic idea as presented in 2 Sam. 7; 2) three interpretations have been given to the Messianic Psalms; 3) exposition of the prophetic Psalms.]

§ 231. The Development of the Idea of the Messiah in the Prophets.

In the earlier prophets, as in Hos. 1: 11; 3: 5; Amos 9: 11, we have only a general reference to the person of the Messiah. Full and detailed predictions of the Messiah are not met with till after the middle of the eighth century, in Isaiah and Micah. Such Messianic prophecy is, however, by no means introduced by them as something absolutely new and till now alien to the prophetic consciousness.¹ ✓

¹ The view which makes the Messianic hope in general originate in the 8th century B. C. cannot be sustained.

To sum up the essential features of Messianic prophecy, let us inquire, what does prophecy teach concerning the *nature* of the Messiah? Does it attribute to Him a superhuman dignity? The meaning of almost all the passages on this subject has been made a matter of controversy.

We begin with Micah 5: 2-4. The words speak either *a*) of an eternal and Divine origin of the Messiah (so Caspari, Boehl and others, the correct view), or state *b*) that the entire sacred history from its very beginnings contains the goings forth of the Messiah, the preparatory elements of His coming (so Hofmann and Orelli). It is noticeable too that the prophets, however near at hand their intuition may make the advent of the Messiah, never speak of Him as the son of any actually existing king. The passage Mic. 5: 3 is parallel with the prophecy Isa. 7: 14 of the birth of Immanuel from the *virgin*, a passage whose reference to the Messiah is demanded by its connection with Isa. 9: 6, though the interpretation at present prevailing regards it as only typically Messianic. The mysterious nature, however, of the expression can neither here nor in Micah be mistaken, and Ewald as well as Orelli and Boehl have defended its Messianic interpretation.

✓ The exalted nature of the Messiah, however, is more definitely brought forward in Isa. 9: 6, 7. The Messiah is evidently regarded as a Divine Being, though here also the expressions are mysteriously indefinite. Compare also Isa. 11: 1-5.

How close, side by side, the two lines of promise,—the appearance of God and the appearance of Messiah—run, and seem almost to touch without uniting, is shown also by the Messianic predictions of the sub-

sequent prophets. In Jer. 23: 5, 6; 33: 15, 16, the Messiah is described as *the Branch of righteousness*, and "Branch" becomes even a *proper name* of the Messiah (Zech. 3: 8; 6: 12). See also Jer. 30: 9; Ezek. 34: 23, 24. The chief Messianic passage in Daniel is found in Dan. 7: 13, 14. Although the interpretation of this passage has been controverted, the traditional exegesis, as far as it can be followed back has regarded the Son of Man as the Messiah, who hence appears, as Paul says, as the Lord from heaven. ✓

[Analysis: 1) Nature of the references in the earlier prophets; 2) the teaching of Micah 5: 2—4; 3) parallel with Isa. 7: 14; 4) the meaning of Isa. 9: 6, 7; 5) of Isa. 11: 1—5; 6) these two ideas of the appearance of Jehovah and of the Messiah revealed also in the later prophets; 7) teaching of Jeremiah; 8) of Ezekiel; 9) of Daniel; 10) of Zechariah.]

§ 232. The Office and Work of the Messiah.

With respect to the *office* and *work* of the Messiah, these are, as the name itself implies, first those of a *king*. His coming presupposes the rejection of the nation, and the deepest humiliation of the house of David; hence the Messianic kingdom rises from an *object* to a *glorious* state. This thought is expressed in Mic. 5: 2, but especially in Isa. 11: 1. The passage in Ezek. 17: 22—24 also treats of this subject. With this corresponds the description in Zech. 9: 9, 10. It is not with the pomp of an earthly conquerer, but with lowly array and riding upon an ass, that the Messiah makes His entry into Jerusalem. Beginning at Jerusalem, He founds a peaceful kingdom, which is to reach from sea to sea, and from the river to the ends of the earth.

An important question here arises: Does the Old Testament also speak of a *suffering Christ*? *i. e.* of One who atones by death and suffering for the sins of the

people. The Messianic passages quoted hitherto do not involve this. According to Isa. 11: 4-9 the Messiah effects the abolition of sin, 1) by judging righteously, and 2) by the fact that under Him the earth shall be full of the *knowledge* of the Lord. But together with these statements, there is another prophetic view which points to a servant of God who suffers in the place of the people, to an act of atonement on which the dawning of the day of redemption depends, to the *priesthood of the Messiah*. To show the connection between this branch of prophecy and the whole doctrinal system of the Old Testament, it will be necessary to enter somewhat more into detail.

[Analysis: 1) The Messiah will be a king; 2) the Messianic kingdom rises from an abject to a glorious state; 3) illustrated by Micah 5: 2; Isa. 11: 1; Ezek. 17: 22-24; 4) teaching of Zech. 9: 9, 10; 5) does the O. T. teach that Christ should suffer? 6) teaching of Isa. 11: 4-9; 7) the O. T. also [teaches that the Messiah will be a priest.]

§ 233. The Servant of Jehovah.

In Ps. 22 a guiltless sufferer, exposed to ruthless enemies and undergoing agonizing torture, prays for deliverance from his misery. While he is wrestling in prayer, faith triumphs. Then follows a description how, in consequence of this Divine act of deliverance, all who are afflicted and exposed to death find refreshment at the sacrificial feast made by the rescued sufferer. The description at the end of the psalm recalls especially the predicted feast of the Messianic days (Isa. 25: 6-8), which God is preparing upon Mount Zion for all nations. Whether the psalm was occasioned by the experience of a David, a Jeremiah, or some other servant of God, the details are minutely descriptive of the Messiah and far surpass any-

thing that could be predicted of any Old Testament character.

That the intercession of the righteous for a sinful nation is effectual, is a thought running through the entire Old Testament. The prophecy of redemption is not complete till it beholds an individual advocating the cause of the people before God; and this is the *servant of Jehovah* (Isa. 53), which can only refer to an *individual*. [This can be the only true interpretation, that the prophetic intuition of the *servant of Jehovah* of Isaiah (40-66) begins with the *nation*, but culminates in an individual. So early as Isa. 42 and 49 the view is gradually transferred from the nation to an individual distinct from the nation, who (Isa. 42: 6) negotiates a covenant for the people, and then becomes the light of the Gentiles. Prophecy rises to the intuition of *one* in whom the image of the faithful servant is complete,—of *one* who, not for His own sins, but as a substitute of the people and for their sins, lays down His life as an offering for sin (Isa. 53: 10), a paying in full for debt, but is notwithstanding the prophetic message which points to Him, despised and regarded by the people, for whom He appears, as stricken of God for His own transgressions, who is, moreover, treated even in death like the violent wicked and like those whom a curse follows even to the grave. But God leads Him from the grave to glory, so that He is now the author of righteousness to many, and divides the spoil with the strong (Isa. 53: 3-12). ✓

[Analysis: 1) The meaning of Ps. 22; 2) of Isa. 25: 6-8; 3) the meaning of "the servant of Jehovah"; 4) development of the idea; 5) interpretation of Isa. 53.]

§ 234. The Messiah is the Atoning High Priest.

Whether Isaiah was himself conscious that this servant of God, who atones by His suffering for the sins of the people, was indeed the Messiah, has been affirmed by some, denied by others, and some affirm that this remains an open question. In Zechariah, however, the Messiah distinctly appears as the future Redeemer of the people, and indeed as their atoning High Priest. This is already seen in Zech. 3: 8-10. This future Atoner to whom the present priesthood typically refers, is *the Branch*, the Son of David, the Messiah. In Zech. 6: 9-15 the Messiah appears as an atoning Priest, and other special features are added in Zech. 12: 10-13. We must also here refer to "the anointed one" of Dan. 9: 26, in connection with that famous passage of Daniel (9: 24-27).

[Analysis: 1) Did Isaiah understand his prophecy? 2) the meaning of Zech. 3: 8-10; 3) of Zech. 6: 9-15; 4) of Zech. 12: 10-13; 5) of Dan. 9: 24-27.]

PART III.



WISDOM.

PART III.

OLD TESTAMENT WISDOM.

§ 235. The Nature of Old Testament Wisdom.

The Old Testament Wisdom (*Hhokhma*) forms, with the law and prophecy, a special department of knowledge, to which three of the canonical books of the Old Testament (Job, Proverbs, and Ecclesiastes), and, in virtue of their matter, many of the Psalms also, pre-eminently belong. The law gives the commandments and claims of Jehovah. Prophecy, proclaims the Word of the Lord, which reveals His counsels, and discloses the object of God's mode of government. The *Hhokhma* does not in an equal manner refer its matter to direct Divine causation, and does not profess to be a word of God in the strictest sense of the term, but rather the product of the wise man's own experience and thought, resulting from reflection upon the truths presented by revelation. It has sometimes been styled the *philosophy* of the Hebrews. But Old Testament wisdom is nevertheless essentially different from other philosophy. It is based, indeed, upon the observation of nature and human affairs, and especially in the latter respect upon experience as handed down by the ancients (Job 12: 7-13; 5: 27; 8: 8-10). In such investigations of nature and human life, however, it is placed under a regulative factor which Greek wisdom does not possess; it starts from a *supernaturalistic* assumption which the latter

lacks. Its mode of procedure, is to endeavor, by means of that key of knowledge which revelation affords, better to understand God's ways in the world, and through the knowledge of God's will furnished by the law, better to determine the duties of human life. The Old Testament wisdom begins by abasing the self-sufficiency of natural knowledge, and giving glory to Divine revelation, *i. e.* it begins with *the fear of the Lord*, as it so often designates its *subjective* principle of knowledge (compare Prov. 30: 1-6).

[Analysis: 1) The Wisdom literature of O. T.; 2) O. T. Wisdom as distinguished from the Law and Prophecy; 3) differs however from Philosophy; 4) takes the fact of revelation as a basis.]

§ 236. The Contents of the Old Testament Wisdom.

But how does the Hhokhma obtain an *objective* principle of knowledge? The Israelitish mind, reflecting on the acts and ways of God as handed down, and on the Divine ordinances by whose discipline it has been strengthened, attains to the perception of their marvelous adaptation to their purpose, especially when it compared the law of Israel with the laws and statutes of heathenism. This impression of the adaptation of the law to its purpose, which the Israelitish mind received, is expressed in numerous passages of the Old Testament (Ps. 147: 19, 20; 19: 7-11), but especially Ps. 119, which proclaims in 176 verses the praises of the law. From the perception of the adaptation of the theocratic ordinances to the purpose of their institution the mind then advances to the thought of an *all-embracing and all-ruling purpose*. The purposes and government of God being then recognized outside the theocracy also, the universe is regarded not as a mere product of the *power* of God, who can create what He *will* (Ps. 115: 3; 135: 6), but

as the product of the Divine *plan*. Thus arises the thought of the Divine *wisdom* as the principle of the world; and this it is which is the *objective principle* of the Hhokhma. The task now presented to the Israelitish mind was to show that a Divine teleology exists everywhere, even beyond the boundary defined by the theocratic ordinances,—a task to which, in prospect of the inexhaustible fulness here offered, it devoted itself with delight.

The *form* peculiar to the Old Testament wisdom is the proverb, which consists of two members, the thought expressed in the first being illustrated more fully in the second part. The proverb requires concise and exact statement, and this brevity of expression is specially illustrated by the maxims in the collection Prov. 10–22, containing for the most part but seven Hebrew words in both members, generally four in the first and three in the second.

[**Analysis:** 1) Meditation on the Divine law reveals its purpose; 2) the praises of the law; 3) the purpose of God's government is recognized 4) as well as God's plan; 5) divine Wisdom is the objective principle of knowledge; 6) the proverb.]

CHAPTER I.

OBJECTIVE DIVINE WISDOM.

§ 237. The Personification of Wisdom.

That the Divine intelligence, that the Divine *nous*, is employed in the creation and preservation of the universe, is laid down as a general proposition in Prov. 3: 19, 20. Though wisdom here appears only as an *attribute* of God, the well-known passage Prov. 8: 22–36, goes further. Wisdom is *personified* in this passage, and is no longer regarded as a mere attribute of God, nor even as a dependent power, but as that creative, arranging, and energizing thought of the world, which proceeds from God, and is objective even to Himself, or, to express it with Delitzsch in a more concrete manner, as the reflection of God's plan of the world objective to Himself. That *wisdom* is objective, that it is regarded as the plan of the universe which proceeded from God, and which has itself become objective to God, is also very evident from Job 28: 12–28. In both of these chief passages (Prov. 8 and Job 28) wisdom is the principle of the world laid down by God, and not a creature like the things in the world, its coming forth from God being, on the contrary, the presupposition of the world's creation. We cannot go further; but, as Nitzsch expresses it, we have here an unmistakable germ of the ontological self-distinction of the Godhead. How closely the Old Testament borders upon actually regarding Wisdom as a personal existence, is shown more especially

by the remarkable passage in Job 15: 7, 8. How are we here reminded of "the one who is in the bosom of the Father" (John 1: 18), and how justly has Ewald found in this passage an echo of the subsequent idea of the Logos! Perhaps, too, the "Son" of God in Prov. 30: 4 may also thus be explained.

[Analysis: 1) The teaching of Prov. 3: 19, 20; 2) wisdom is personified in Prov. 8: 22—36, 3) teaching of Job 28: 12—28; 4) wisdom regarded as objective to God Himself; 5) teaching of Job 15: 7, 8; 6) of Prov. 30: 4.]

§ 238. The Old Testament View of Nature.

In the Old Testament the world is not regarded merely as the product of power, but more definitely as the product of an almighty will ordering all in conformity with its *purpose*. It is according to this principle that the Old Testament view of nature must be defined. The ruling omnipotence of God is placed above all. He who has subjected all that is in heaven and on earth to His laws (Job 38: 11, 33; Jer. 31: 35; 33: 25), makes also the course of nature subserve His *purpose*. This purpose is, in general, the manifestation of the Divine glory. The order of nature is further placed in connection with *the moral order* of the world. What the Mosaic doctrine of retribution teaches (see § 89) concerning this connection, viz., that the course of nature subserves the purpose of Divine justice, is maintained to its full extent in the Hhokhma.

[Analysis: 1) The O. T. views of nature; 2) the ruling omnipotence of God; 3) all under subjection to God's purpose; 4) connection between the order of nature and the moral order of the world.]

§ 239. The Control of Wisdom in Human Affairs.

Not only nature, but *human affairs*, are controlled by wisdom as an objective Divine principle. That

same wisdom which is the governing principle of the universe, has taken up its abode on earth, and rules as a sovereign all the events of life, in which a Divine design, and therefore Divine intelligence, is everywhere perceptible.

If we inquire more closely as to the means by which wisdom makes her appeal to man, Prov. 1: 23 points to those factors of revelation, the Word and the Spirit. Indeed the Word is the vehicle of the Spirit. The effect of this upon men is first designated as *instruction*. The idea of instruction is one of the fundamental ideas of the Proverbs of Solomon,—one of the seven pillars (Prov. 9: 1), as Oetinger says, upon which the house of wisdom is supported. Wisdom and instruction are inseparably connected (Prov. 1: 2, 7; 23: 23); the way to wisdom is called a reception of instruction (Prov. 1: 3; 19: 20). The preservation of wisdom is only possible by taking fast hold of instruction (Prov. 4: 13; 10: 17). Consequently it is with this instruction or reproof that the educational agency of wisdom upon man must begin; for man is by nature ignorant of the way of salvation, and easily seduced to evil. He who will not be convinced, who in his self-sufficiency will not receive the reproofs of instruction, nay, hates them, shows himself thereby to be a *fool*, brutish, and is in his incorrigibleness hastening to irretrievable ruin (Prov. 1: 24–27; 12: 1; 13: 18; etc.). He who fears God submits to this reproof of instruction, and walks in the way of wisdom (Prov. 1: 8, 9).

[Analysis: 1) Human affairs are controlled by wisdom; 2) by the Spirit through the Word; 3) the effect is instruction; 4) wisdom only preserved through instruction; 5) why man must be instructed; 6) difference between the foolish and the wise man.]

CHAPTER II.

SUBJECTIVE HUMAN WISDOM.

§ 240. The Fear of the Lord the Subjective Principle of Wisdom.

The subjective principle of wisdom is, then, *the fear of the Lord* (Prov. 1: 7). The fear of the Lord is the knowledge of *the All-Holy* (Prov. 9: 10). This Divine holiness addresses itself, in that law which reveals the perfect will of God, to the free will of man. Consequently the fear of the Lord, as the knowledge of the All-Holy, is based upon the will of God which opposes all selfish and sinful human efforts, and appoints, in conformity with His purpose of salvation, an end and measure to all things; it is the dread of disobeying this holy will of God. Hence it involves, according to the just definition of its moral characteristics (Prov. 8: 13), hatred of "evil, pride, arrogance, and the evil way." From this fear of God proceeds also the effort 1) to *perceive* in everything the end designed by the Divine will; and 2) to *realize* it in every action, as it is said, "in all thy ways acknowledge Him" (Prov. 3: 6). The former may be called theoretical, the latter practical wisdom. This fear of God is not, however, a slavish one, but rather a relation of intimacy with God, for "the secret (counsel or friendship) of the Lord is with them that fear Him" (Ps. 25: 14).

[Analysis: 1) The subjective principle of wisdom; 2) in what this wisdom consists; 3) the normal characteristics of a holy fear; 4) its two-fold aim; 5) not a slavish fear.]

§ 241. Practical Wisdom.

Subjective wisdom, though by no means excluding theoretical questions, is yet for the most part practical, and bent upon accomplishing the holy will of God in human life. Since, however, this will of God aims not only at the external consecration of the life, but also at the sanctification *of the heart and temper*, the ethics of the Old Testament doctrine of wisdom does not treat only, as has been so often supposed, of a restoration of an external legality of conduct. The ethics of the book of Proverbs seeks to arouse the fear of God, and of the all-seeing Searcher of hearts (Prov. 15: 11; 16: 2; etc.). *Conviction of sin* is required (Prov. 20: 9). Prov. 28: 13 declares the duty of *confessing sin*, and the happiness of obtaining *forgiveness*. Sacrifice, as a mere external work is rejected (Prov. 15: 8). Among the exhortations in Prov. 4: 20–27 the greatest stress is laid (v. 23) upon keeping the *heart* (“above all that thou guardest”).

[Analysis: 1) Subjective wisdom aims at the sanctification of the heart; 2) conviction of sin is demanded.]

§ 242. The Ethics of the Proverbs.

Notwithstanding what has been said, it must be confessed that the wisdom of the Proverbs is chiefly concerned with the sphere of the *external* life. The ethics of the Proverbs is of an undeniable *negative character*, and presents by reason of the constant reflection upon the end designed by that which they require, an appearance of coldness and extreme moderation. The impelling power of love is wanting as a motive.

In consequence of this negative character, it is rather *justice* than love which is *the duty* a man owes

to his neighbor; and it has even been a matter of reproach against the ethics of these maxims, that they sometimes border upon the recommendation of a selfish prudence. But the Book of Proverbs has numerous maxims, which relate to the practice of those duties resulting from the *principle of love*, placability being inculcated (Prov. 10: 12); the love of enemies (25: 21, 22); peaceableness (17: 14; 20: 3); gentleness and patience (15: 1, 18); forbearance to the poor (22: 22), in impressing which last named virtue, it is expressly stated that the Creator is honored by him that hath mercy on the needy (14: 31).

[Analysis: 1) The ethics of the Book of Proverbs mainly negative; 2) more stress is laid on justice than love; 3) but the principle of love is also urged.]

CHAPTER III.

MORAL GOOD.

§ 243. The Realization of the Moral Good in the Individual Life.

The teaching of the Hhokhma concerning the possession of earthly good is entirely based upon the Mosaic doctrine of retribution. What this expresses as the *shall* of promise and threatening, is announced in Proverbs as a fact, and that with the assurance arising from direct *experience* (13: 9, 21). A number of sayings on this subject are found in the speeches of the three friends of Job, who explicitly aim to exhibit the actual reality of the Divine law of retribution. That the life, which is the reward of wisdom, is regarded both in Proverbs and in the legal doctrine of retribution as earthly and of this world, is generally admitted; the question, however, is whether the teaching of Proverbs *is limited thereto*. Ewald, in particular, asserts that Proverbs teaches a happy life in another world. Upon the whole it is worthy of note that the Proverbs make mention of Sheol (*Rephaim*), only when speaking of the final lot of the wicked. It is thither that the paths of the adulteress lead (Prov 2: 18; 5: 5; 7: 27; 9: 18); while not a word is said of the passing of the pious and the wise, also, into Sheol, the Hades of the New Testament. The Book of Proverbs draws, so to speak, a veil over the state of the righteous in Hades.

The doctrine of the Hhokhma has often been desig-

nated as pure Eudemonism, *i. e.* as teaching that wisdom and righteousness are but means for the attainment of prosperity as the proper object of life. On the contrary, however, it could not be more distinctly stated than it is in the Book of Proverbs, that it is wrong to make earthly prosperity, in and for itself, the object of life (Prov. 11: 4, 28; 15: 16; etc.). The beautiful passage, Prov. 30: 7-9, may especially be mentioned, as showing how earthly prosperity is ever to be prized only in proportion as it is accompanied by godly and righteous conduct.

[Analysis: 1) Stress is laid on the doctrine of retribution; 2) is the teaching of Proverbs limited to earthly retribution?; 3) the teaching concerning Sheol; 5) earthly prosperity is not the true object of life.]

§ 244. Realization of Moral Good in the various Social Spheres.

Moral good is not realized in individual life alone, but also in the various social spheres.

1) Domestic happiness is the chief of those good things with which the fear of God is rewarded. Both the *conjugal* and the *parental* relations are regarded by the Hhokhma with a moral and religious seriousness, the like of which is not found in any one of the nations of antiquity. Marriage is designated as a covenant of God (Prov. 2: 17). "House and riches are an inheritance from fathers: but a prudent wife is from the Lord" (Prov. 19: 14), *i. e.* marriages are made in heaven. No sin is more frequently or more sharply reprov'd in Proverbs than the violation of conjugal fidelity (Prov. 2: 12-22; 5: 1-23; 6: 23-35; 7: 1-27). With this corresponds the appreciation of the blessing of children. Hence it is expressly required that children be carefully trained, by strict discipline and

religious and moral instruction. Parents are also warned to begin the instruction of their children betimes, and thus to retain them for their whole life. A complete statement of the educational precepts given in Proverbs would here be out of place. It may suffice to point out how earnestly *diligence* is insisted on, and sloth branded as a contemptible thing (6: 6-11; 10: 26; 15: 19; 19: 15, 24; 20: 4, 13; 26: 13-16); how *temperance* (13: 25; 23: 19-21) and *chastity* are required, and temptations to unchastity warned against (7: 5-23; 23: 26-28). The education of *girls* is never separably treated of in Proverbs. It is a self-evident assumption that they too were instructed in the law. The end contemplated in female education may be perceived from the description of the excellent woman in Prov. 31: 10-31, and the passages Prov. 11: 16, 22; 12: 4: etc. Modesty and moral tact are the ornaments of woman (Prov. 11: 22).

2) *Political* life and *well-ordered civil institutions* are regarded as component parts of moral good. The view that kings and judges are the organs of the Divine government of the world, and vice-regents of the Supreme Ruler and Judge, and that as such they are appointed to administer justice, especially by executing severe judgment upon the wicked, forms the foundation of a whole series of proverbs (Prov. 16: 12-15; 20: 8, 26; etc.). All political wisdom is comprised in the saying: "Righteousness exalteth a nation, but sin is a reproach to any people" (Prov. 14: 34).

[Analysis: 1) Stress is laid upon domestic happiness; 2) marriage is of God; 3) conjugal infidelity sharply reproved; 4) children are to be carefully trained; 5) special virtues are to be inculcated; 6) education of girls; 7) the secret of success of a nation.]

CHAPTER IV.

THE ENIGMAS OF HUMAN LIFE.

§ 245. The Enigmas Themselves.

That which above all else gave rise to the struggle between faith and doubt, was the perception that the actual course of events did not harmonize with the postulate of *the doctrine of retribution*,—that the God who judges righteously did not make His righteous judgment evident in what befell either nations or individuals. It is on this account that Job is so often reproached by his friends for resembling the wicked by disputing the Divine retribution. While the perplexities caused by the fortunes of nations were solved for the prophets by the view afforded them of the consummation of the Divine kingdom,—of the day of the Lord when judgment and deliverance should manifest the Divine righteousness,—it was concerning the enigmas of individual life, presented by the prosperity of the wicked and the calamities of the godly, that the reflecting mind of the Old Testament sages struggled to obtain light. Several of the Psalms dwell on this matter, which is the special subject of the whole Book of Job.

[Analysis: 1) The doctrine of retribution does not seem to be actually carried out in this life; 2) the case of nations could be explained; 3) but the enigmas of the individual life not so clear; 4) the problem discussed in the Book of Job.]

§ 246. The Struggle to solve the Enigmas relating to this Subject in the Psalms.

In those Psalms which relate to the contradiction existing between the moral worth of an individual

and his external circumstances, we generally find that the knot is not untied, but simply cut. The wicked who think themselves so secure will surely perish, and in prayer the Psalmist surmounts every hindrance. See especially the supplicatory Psalms (3, 4, 5, 7, etc.). Another special feature is to be remarked in those Psalms in which that judgment upon his enemies which the Psalmist confidently entreats is also in measure announced—the so-called *imprecatory Psalms*, of which Ps. 59, 69, and 109 are the strongest. Instead of being shocked at them, we need simply to understand them. And it is easy to perceive that what we find in them is no private feeling of anger venting itself in curses, but that they are the product of a zeal for the honor of that God who is attacked in His servants (Ps. 69: 9).

The New Testament itself knows of no other final reconciliation of the contradiction introduced into the world by the great existence of evil than that which is accomplished by judgment. But the difference between the two Testaments lies in the circumstance that the Old Testament, referring, as far as retribution is concerned, exclusively to this life, does not afford the same scope for the Divine long-suffering as the New, and must demand an actual and adequate sentence, an infliction of judgment upon the ungodly within the limits of earthly existence. The solution furnished by certain Psalms is not a dogmatic one, *i. e.* no doctrine actually leading beyond the limits of Mosaism is arrived at. It is rather a solution which is *subjective and personal*. The communion with God to which the Psalmist has been admitted asserts itself with such strength, that he not only finds therein his full compensation for the prosperity of the wicked, but, rising for the moment

superior to death and Sheol, knows himself to be inseparably united to God. The first chief passage in which the feeling of saving and indissoluble union with God is poured forth is Ps. 16. To this feeling we must certainly refer such passages as Ps. 48: 14 and 68: 20, which some have also interpreted of deliverance from death in the New Testament sense. In Ps. 73: 26, the Psalmist expresses his confidence that even if his heart fails in death, his communion with God cannot be dissolved.

Still, even in these passages, we have no direct word from God for this hope to lean on; they express rather the postulate of faith, that for the just, existence must issue in glory, and in the permanent possession of communion with God. The seals of death and Sheol remain as yet unbroken in the Old Testament, as is so strongly and incisively expressed in Ps. 88. The conquerer of death and Hades had not yet come. The question whether the announcement of the resurrection of the dead made by the prophets finds an echo in the Psalms, has been variously answered. We cannot quote Ps. 90: 3, nor 141: 7 in favor of the affirmative view, as has been done by some, but possibly Ps. 22: 25–31 may refer to the resurrection.

[Analysis: 1) The Psalms do not solve the problem; 2) in the supplicatory Psalms the knot is simply cut; 3) the imprecatory Psalms; 4) the way the N. T. solves the problem; 5) the difference between the views of the two Testaments; 6) the solution of the Psalms are subjective and personal; 7) teaching of Ps. 16: 8–11; 8) of Ps. 48: 14; 68: 20; 9) of Ps. 73: 26; 10) of Ps. 88; 11) no positive reference to the resurrection in the Psalms.]

§ 247. Solution of the Enigmas in the Book of Job.

All the enigmas with which Israelitish wisdom was occupied are discussed in the Book of Job, and every solution produced upon Old Testament soil is at-

tempted. A fragment of Old Testament life is brought before us, and it is shown by Job's example, how a righteous man may fall into such grievous temptation as to threaten his trust in God with shipwreck, and how the struggles of faith at last result in victory. This book has often been contrasted with Mosaism, as coming to a formal rupture with the doctrine of retribution. This is, however, far from being the case,—the Mosaic doctrine of retribution being, on the contrary, expressly confirmed by the issue, viz. the abundant compensation of the hero of the book for his sufferings.

This book teaches us to recognize *a four-fold purpose* in human suffering. 1) There is a *penal suffering* with which God visits the ungodly. This proposition is discussed in manifold aspects by the three friends of Job (see especially ch. 8; 15: 20–35; ch. 18 and 20), and at last conceded by Job himself (27: 11–23. 2) There is a *Divine chastisement* imposed upon all men, which is necessarily due to the natural impurity and sinfulness of human nature, and must accordingly be borne by the righteous also. This is the doctrine which Eliphaz advances in his first speech, in explanation of the calamities of Job (ch. 4), where in verses 12–16, he refers to a revelation imparted to him in a night vision. 3) There is also a special *testing and purifying* of the righteous imposed upon them by the love of God, for the purpose of delivering them from secret pride, of leading them to humble and penitent self-knowledge, and thus insuring to them the Divine favor. This is the doctrine which Elihu brings forward in Job 33: 14–30; 36: 5–15. 4) There is a suffering which is designed *to manifest the triumph of faith* and the fidelity of the righteous. This it is which was the

immediate object of Job's afflictions, as already alluded to in the *prologue* of the book, and evidenced to all in the *epilogue*.

But while the Book of Job thus offers a key to these afflictions of the righteous, it at the same time furnishes reasons for believing in the *righteous providence of God*, from the consideration of His character and His dominion over nature. 1) Divine providence may be inferred from *the character of God*. The fundamental thought of the profound speech of Elihu (Job 34: 10 sqq.) is: God by reason of His *power* over the world, can never be unjust. God cannot be unjust to that which He Himself called into existence, and maintains therein. He so directs the lot of individuals and nations, that right is also at last made manifest. 2) But Divine Providence may also be inferred from God's *dominion over nature*. This proposition is already prepared for in Job 28, the idea being there carried out that man, though incapable of becoming possessed of the Divine wisdom itself, is yet able to recognize its traces in the whole economy of nature, and may therefore, with regard to the Divine appointment of human life, resign himself to, and fall back on, the fear of God. This point of view is especially maintained by Elihu in 36: 22 and in that fine passage 37: 21–24 (a storm is supposed to be approaching).

[Analysis: 1) The problem of the Book of Job; 2) the Mosaic doctrine of retribution confirmed; 3) there is a fourfold purpose in human suffering; 4) divine providence proved from the character of God; 5) and from His dominion over nature.]

§ 248. The Doctrine of Immortality in the Book of Job.

The question which still remains to be discussed is, what position does the Book of Job, which keeps

the attention directed to the state of man after death, beyond any Book of the Old Testament, occupy with regard to the *doctrine of immortality*? The notion that its direct purpose is to prove the doctrine of the immortality of the human soul, rests upon a misconception. It is, however, true that in it are deposited the presuppositions of the hope of eternal life. A remarkable progress is in this respect manifested in this book. See Job 7: 7-9; 10: 20-22; 14: 7-15; 16: 18-22; 19: 25-27. But that final solution of all enigmas, that the sufferings of this present world are not worthy to be compared with the glory that shall be revealed in the children of God, was not discovered by Job, nor by the Old Testament in general. By reason of the constant connection existing between revealed knowledge and the facts of revelation, a belief in eternal life which should be truly stable could not arise until the acquisition of eternal life, as faith in Him who in His own person overcame death and brought life and immortality to light, and who through His redeeming work has perfected also the saints of the Old Testament (Heb. 11: 40).

[Analysis: 1) The object of the Book of Job has often been misunderstood; 2) the doctrine of immortality clearly taught; 3) but still imperfectly; 4) the teaching of the N. T.]

CHAPTER V.

THE SOLUTION ATTEMPTED IN THE BOOK OF ECCLESIASTES.

§ 249. Standpoint of this Book. Inquiry concerning Divine Retribution and Immortality.

The Book of *Koheleth* or *Ecclesiastes* forms the conclusion of the canonical Old Testament Hhokhma. Its standpoint may be briefly designated as that of *resignation*—an abandonment of the attempt to comprehend the Divine government of the world, the reality of which to *faith*, it however, firmly holds. This book is equally misunderstood when its author is credited with a knowledge beyond the limits of the Old Testament, and especially with the knowledge of eternal life, etc., and when he is regarded as a fatalist, or an Epicurean. So little does this book preach infidelity, that its author does not surrender even one of the doctrines transmitted to him. *That* there is a Divine government of the world, *that* there is a righteous retribution, faith may not question: it is the *how* of these matters that man is unable to comprehend. Man is not able to understand the result produced by the God-ordained course of the world. This appears especially in respect to *Divine Retribution*. Experience is seen by the author of the Book of Ecclesiastes to be always at variance with the adoption of this doctrine. To this is added the sad experience of the impunity of the wicked. Still all this must not destroy the postulate of faith (Eccles. 8: 12, 13).

With reference to the question whether Ecclesiastes teaches the *immortality* of man, we answer that the author of this book distinctly assumes that there is a *future retribution*. Towards the close of the book, the author, dismissing all the doubts resulting from natural observation, positively expresses (Eccles. 12: 7) the tenet that the spirit of man returns to God who gave it; and in 12: 14 compared with 11: 9, that God will bring every secret thing to judgment, whether it be good or whether it be evil. We cannot, however, determine from the book the author's exact view of the state after death, nor decide in what sense he teaches a future judgment.

[Analysis: 1) The standpoint of Ecclesiastes; 2) the author is neither a fatalist nor an Epicurean; 3) he does not preach infidelity; 4) the questions at issue; 5) he teaches a future retribution.]

§ 250. Moral Teaching of the Book of Ecclesiastes. Conclusion.

The *moral teaching* imparted in this book corresponds with the standpoint of resignation which it occupies. Prudence, moderation in all things, is the quality to be most urgently recommended. The gladness which imparts vigor to the inner life is, however, not found in the Preacher. In patient composure, the wise man does at all times just that which is seasonable and commits the issue to God. The frame of mind possessed by the wise man in the midst of all this composure is shown in Eccles. 7: 2-4. Ecclesiastes may be called a book of worldly sadness, not the sadness of one utterly sick of life, but of one who, though weary, does not suffer the stimulus of eternity to be plucked out of his heart, and who has rescued his fear of God out of the ruins of his earthly hopes

and schemes. The dialectics of the Book of Ecclesiastes, with their mainly negative result, forms a transition *from the Old to the New Testament*. For from a persuasion of the vanity of all earthly good, arises the longing after the eternal and saving blessings of the New Testament, and the desire for the coming of that immutable kingdom of God announced by prophecy, in which the inquiries of Old Testament and all other wisdom have found their enduring object. In no other book does the Old Testament appear so much as in the Book of Ecclesiastes, as "that which is becoming old and waxing aged and nigh unto vanishing away" (Heb. 8: 13).

[Analysis: 1) The moral teaching of the Book of Ecclesiastes; 2) the book of sad resignation; 3) the book of transition from the Old to the New Testament.]

SELECT LITERATURE

OF

BIBLICAL THEOLOGY OF THE OLD TESTAMENT.

1. OF BIBLICAL THEOLOGY IN GENERAL.

1. Beck, J. T. *Christliche Lehrwissenschaft*. Stuttgart, 1841.
2. Bennett, W. H. *The Theology of the Old Testament*. New York, 1896.
3. Briggs, C. A. *Biblical Study*, etc. Pp. 367—405. New York, 1883.
4. Buddeus, J. F. *Historia Ecclesiastica Veteris Testamenti*, etc. Ed. 3. 2 Bde. 1726, 1729,
A work of permanent value.
5. Foster, R. V. *Old Testament Studies*. Chicago, 1890.
6. Glassius, Sal. *Philologia Sacra*, etc. Leipsic, 1705.
This edition by Olearius is the best.
7. Haevernick, H. A. C. *Vorlesungen ueber die Theol. des A. T.* 2nd ed. 1863.
8. Hofmann, J. Chr. K. *Der Schriftbeweis*. 3 Bde. 2. Aufl. Noerdlingen 1857—1860.
9. Kayser, A. *Die Theol. des A. T.* Strassburg, 1886.
10. Koehler, A. *Biblische Geschichte des Alten Testaments*. 2 Bde. Erlangen 1877—89.
11. Luz, S. *Bibl. Dogmatik*. 1877.
12. Oehler, G. F. *Theology of the Old Testament*. Edited by Day. New York, 1883. Third German edition. Stuttgart, 1891.
13. Piepenbring, C. *Theology of the Old Testament*. Transl. from the French. New York, 1893.
14. Riehm, E. *Alttestamentliche Theologie*, 1890.
15. Roos, M. F. *Einleitung in die biblischen Geschichte des Alten Testaments*, etc. Reprinted. Stuttgart, 1876.
16. Schlottmann, Konstantin. *Kompendium der bibl. Theologie des A. und N. T.* 2nd ed., Leipsic, 1894.
17. Schultz, F. W. *Theologie des Alten Testaments*. In Zoeckler's *Handbuch* der theologischen Wissenschaften. Noerdlingen, 1889.

18. Schultz, Herm. *Alttestamentliche Theologie*. Fifth ed. 1896. Transl. of the 4th ed. into English. 2 vols. Edinburgh, 1892.

Valuable articles on special topics will be found in the Dictionaries and Encyclopædias edited by Fairbairn, Hamburger, Herzog-Plitt-Hauck, Kitto-Alexander, M'Clintock-Strong, Riehm, Schaff-Herzog, Schenkel, Smith-Hackett-Abbot, and Winer.

2. OF THE ANGELS.

1. Barry, Alfred. Article on *Angels* in Smith's Bible Dictionary. Compare especially the full literature given by Hackett and Abbot, covering the whole subject (Jewish notions, Early Fathers, Representation in Christian Art, "Angel of Jehovah", Modern works).
2. Duke, H. H. *The Holy Angels*; their nature and employments as recorded in the Word of God. London, 1875.
3. Dunn, L. R. *The Angels of God*. New York 1881.
4. Godet, F. *Studies on the Old Testament*. Third edition. New York, 1884.
5. Hengstenberg, E. W. *The Books of Moses and Egypt*. Andover, 1843.
6. Hofmann, J. Chr. K. *Der Schriftbeweis*. Vol. 1. 314—403.
7. Kurtz, J. H. *Die Ehen der Soehne Gottes*, etc. Berlin, 1857.
8. Ode, J. *Commentarius de Angelis*. Traj. ad Rhen., 1739.
An exhaustive work of more than 1100 quarto pages.
9. Whately, R. *Scripture Revelations concerning Good and Evil Angels*. Philadelphia, 1856.
See the various Lexicons on Angels, Cherubim, Gabriel, Michael, Seraphim, Angel of Jehovah, etc.
See works on Biblical Theology and Systematic Theology. The literature of this subject is immense.

3. OF CREATION.

1. Birks, T. R. *The Scripture Doctrine of Creation*, etc. New York, 1875.
2. Buddensieg, R. *Die Assyrischen Ausgrabungen und das Alte Testament*. Heilb., 1880.
3. Calderwood, Henry. *The Relation of Science and Religion*. Pp. 13—323. New York, 1881.
4. Dawson, J. W. *Nature and the Bible*. Pp. 257. New York, 1875.
5. Dawson, J. W. *The Origin of the World*, etc. New York, 1877.
6. Delitzsch, Franz. *Commentary on Genesis*. 4th edition, 2 vols. New York 1889. Facile princeps.

7. Godet, F. *Biblical Studies on the Old Testament*. New York, 1884.
8. Grant, P. W. *The Bible Record of Creation True for every Age*. 1877.
9. Guyot, A. *Creation, etc.* New York, 1884.
10. Kurtz, J. H. *The Bible and Astronomy*. Philadelphia, 1861. (Fifth German Edition, 1865).
11. Lewis T. *The Six Days of Creation, etc.* Pp. 416. New York, 1879.
12. Luthardt, C. E. *Fundamental Truths of Christianity*. Edinburgh, 1869.
13. McCaul, A. *The Mosaic Record of Creation*. In *Aids to Faith*. London, 1861.
14. Pratt, John H. *Scripture and Science not at Variance*. Seventh edition. London, 1872.
15. Reusch, F. H. *Nature and the Bible*. 1886.
16. Schultz, F. W. *Die Schoepfungsgeschichte nach Naturwissenschaft und Bibel*. Gotha, 1865.
17. Zoeckler, O. *Die Urgeschichte der Erde und des Menschen*. Guetersloh, 1868.
18. Zoeckler, O. *Geschichte der Beziehungen zw. Theol. und Naturwissenschaft, etc.* 2 vols. Guetersloh, 1876—79.

4. OF GOD.

1. Alexander, W. Lindsay. *The Connection and Harmony of the Old and New Testaments*. London, 1853.
Also the same author's Articles in *Kitto* (Alexander's edition).
2. Ewald, H. *Revelation. Its Nature and Record*. Edinburgh.
3. Ewald H. *Old and New Testament Theology*. Edinburgh.
4. Hengstenberg, E. W. *Dissertations on the Genuineness of the Pentateuch*. 2 vols. Edinburgh, 1847.
5. Hoelemann, H. G. *Bibelstudien*. Vol. 1. Leipsic, 1861.
6. Noeldecke. *Ueber den Gottesnamen El*. Berlin, 1880.
7. Oehler, G. T. Articles on *Elohim* and *Jehovah* in Herzog, first edition. [Re-written by Delitzsch for the second edition.
8. Schmieder. *Betrachtungen Ueber das hohepriesterliche Gebet*. 1848.
"A book which is not known so well as it deserves to be" (Oehler).
9. Wright, W. A. Article on *Jehovah* in Smith's Bible Dictionary.

See works on Old Testament Theology already cited, and works on Systematic Theology.

5. CRITICISM.

1. Baudissin, W. *Studien zur semit. Religionsgeschichte*. 1876—78.
2. Baxter, W. L. *Sanctuary and Sacrifice*. A Reply to Wellhausen. London, 1895.
3. Binnie, W. *The Proposed Reconstruction of Old Testament History*. Third edition. Edinburgh, 1880.
4. Bissel, E. C. *The Pentateuch, its Origin and Structure*. New York, 1885.
This volume contains a list of some 3000 works bearing on the Criticism of the O. T.
5. Boehl, E. *Zum Gesetz u. zum Zeugniss*. Wien, 1883.
6. Boyce, W. B. *The Higher Criticism and the Bible*. London, 1880.
7. Cave, Alfred. *Inspiration of the Old Testament*. 2nd ed. London, 1888.
8. Curtiss, S. S. *The Levitical Priests*. Edinburgh, 1877.
9. Douglas, G. C. M. *Isaiah One and His Book One*. New York, 1895.
10. Driver, S. R. *Introduction to the Literature of the O. T.* New York, 1891.
11. Ellicott, C. J. *Christus Comprobator*. London, 1891.
12. Girdlestone, R. B. *The Foundations of the Bible*. London.
13. Green, W. H. *Moses and the Prophets*. New York, 1883.
14. Green, W. H. *The Hebrew Feasts*. New York, 1885.
15. Green, W. H. *The Higher Criticism of the Pentateuch*. New York, 1895.
16. Green, W. H. *The Unity of the Book of Genesis*. New York, 1895.
17. Koenig, F. E. *The Religious History of Israel*. Edinburgh.
18. Koenig, E. *Einleitung in das Alte Testament*. 1893.
19. Kuenen, A. *The Religion of Israel, etc.* 3 vols. London, 1874—75.
20. Kurtz, J. H. *History of the Old Covenant*. 3 vols. 1859.
21. Leathes, Stanley. *The Law in the Prophets*. London, 1891.
22. *Lex Mosaica*. The Law of Moses and the Higher Criticism. London 1894.
Contains 14 important articles by as many conservative writers.
23. Lias, J. J. *Principles of Biblical Criticism*. London, 1893.

24. Robertson, James. *The Early Religion of Israel*. Edinburgh.
25. Rupprecht, E. *Des Rätsels Lösung*. 1895.
26. Schrader, E. *The Cuneiform Inscriptions and the Old Testament*. 2 vols. London, 1885—86.
27. Schmauk, T. E. *The Negative Criticism and the Old Testament*. 1894.
28. Stebbins. *A Study of the Pentateuch*. Boston, 1881.
29. Smith, W. Robertson. *The Old Testament in the Jewish Church*. New York, 1881.
30. Watts, Robert. *The Newer Criticism and the Analogy of Faith*. Third edition. Edinburgh, 1882.
31. Vos, G. *The Mosaic Origin of the Pentateuchal Codes*. 1886.
32. Zahn, A. *Das Deuteronomium*. Guetersloh, 1890.

6. OF PROPHECY.

1. Baudissin, W. *Die Gesch. des Alt. Priesterthums*, Leipsic, 1889.
2. Boehl, E. *Christologie des Alten Testamentes*, etc. Wien, 1882.
3. Briggs, Charles, A. *Messianic Prophecy*. New York, 1886.
4. Dalman, G. H. *Der leidende und der sterbende Messias der Synagoge*. 1888.
5. Davidson, John. *Discourses on Prophecy*, etc. (Warburtonian Lecture). Fourth edition. London, 1839.
6. Delitzsch, Franz. *Die bibl. prophet. Theologie*, etc. Leipsic, 1845.
7. Delitzsch Franz. *Messianic Prophecy*. Translated by Prof. Curtiss. Edinburgh, 1880.
8. Delitzsch, Franz. *Old Testament History of Redemption*. Edinburgh, 1881.
9. Delitzsch, Franz. *Messianic Prophecies in Historical Succession*. Translated by Samuel Ives Curtiss. Edinburgh, 1891.
10. Diestel, L. *Geschichte des A. T. in der christ. Kirche*. Jena, 1869.
11. Duhm, B. *Die Theologie der Propheten*. Bonn, 1875.
12. Fairbairn, P. *Prophecy, viewed in respect to its distinctive nature*, etc. Second edition, 1866.
13. Gloag, Paton J. *The Messianic Prophecies*. Baird Lectures for 1879. Edinburgh, 1879.
14. Green, William Henry. *Moses and the Prophets*. New York, 1883.

15. Hengstenberg, E. W. *Christology of the Old Testament*, etc. 4 vols. Edinburgh, 1854, 56, 58.
16. Hofmann, J. C. K. *Weissagung u. Erfuellung*, etc. 2 vols. Noerdlingen, 1841—44.
17. Kirkpatrick, A. F. *The Doctrine of the Prophets*. New York, 1893.
18. Koenig, Edward. *Der Offenbarungsbegriff des A. T.* Leipsic, 1882.
19. Kuenen, A. *Prophets and Prophecy in Israel*. 1877.
20. Kueper. *Das Prophetenthum des Alten Bundes*. 1870.
21. Orelli, C. von. *The Old Testament Prophecy of the Consummation of God's Kingdom*, etc. Edinburgh, 1885.
22. Riehm, E. *Messianic Prophecy*, etc. Edinburgh, 1875.
23. Smith, J. Pye. *The Scripture Testimony to the Messiah*, etc. 2 vols. Fifth edition. Edinburgh, 1859.
24. Smith, R. Payne. *Prophecy a Preparation for Christ*. Bampton Lectures for 1869. London 1870.
25. Smith, W. R. *The Prophets of Israel*. New York, 1882.

7. OF BIBLICAL PSYCHOLOGY.

1. Beck, J. T. *Outlines of Biblical Psychology*. Third Edition. Edinburgh, 1877.
2. Delitzsch, Franz. *A System of Biblical Psychology*. Second edition. Edinburgh, 1869.
3. Goeschel. *Der Mensch nach Leib, Seele und Geist*, etc. Leipsic, 1856.
4. Haussmann, J. G. F. *Die Biblische Lehre vom Menschen*. 1848.
5. Heard, J. B. *The Tripartite Nature of Man*. Fifth edition. Edinburgh, 1885.
6. Laidlaw, John. *The Bible Doctrine of Man*. Seventh series of Cunningham Lectures. Edinburgh, 1883.
7. Rudloff. *Die Lehre vom Menschen nach Geist, Seele, und Leib*. 1858.
8. Wendt. *Die Begriffe Fleisch und Geist im bibl. Sprachgebrauch*. Gotha, 1878.
9. Zöckler, Otto. *Die Lehre vom Urstand des Menschen*, etc. Guetersloh, 1879.

8. OF THE SABBATH.

1. Cox, Robert. *The Literature of the Sabbath Question*. 2 vols. Edinburgh, 1865.
2. Gilfillan, James. *The Sabbath* viewed in the light of Reason, Revelation, and History, with sketches of its Literature. New York, 1862.

3. Hessey, J. A. *Sunday. Its Origin, History, and Present Obligation.* Bampton Lectures for 1860. Fourth edition. London, 1880.

9. OF SACRIFICES.

1. Baehr, K. C. W. T. *Symbolik des Mos. Kultus.* 2 Bde. Heidelberg, 1837, 39. A second edition of first volume appeared in 1874.
2. Cave, Alfred. *The Scriptural Doctrine of Sacrifice.* Edinburgh, 1877.
3. Delitzsch, F. *Commentary on Hebrews.* 2 vols. Edinburgh, 1882.
4. Dillmann, A. *Die Bucher Exodus und Leviticus.* Leipsic, 1880.
5. Faber, G. S. *A treatise on the Origin of Expiatory Sacrifice.* London, 1827.
6. Hengstenberg, E. W. *The Sacrifices of Holy Scripture.* Pp. 367—409 of *Commentary on Ecclesiastes with other Treatises.* Philadelphia, 1860.
7. Hengstenberg, E. W. *Egypt and the Books of Moses.* Edinburgh, 1845.
8. Jukes, A. *The Law of the Offerings, etc.* Boston. No date.
9. Keil, C. F. *Handbook of Biblical Archeology.* Translated from the German. 2 vols. Edinburgh.
10. Kliefoth, Th. *Liturgische Abhandlungen.* Vol. 4. 1. *Der alt-und neut. Cultus.* Schwerin, 1858.
11. Kueper. *Das Priesterthum des A. Bundes.* Berlin, 1866.
12. Kurtz, J. H. *Sacrificial Worship of the Old Testament.* Edinburgh, 1863.
13. Magee, Wm. *On Atonement and Sacrifice.* London, 1856.
14. Outram. *Two Dissertations on Sacrifices, etc.* Translated by John Allen. London, 1828.
15. Philippi, F. A. *Kirchliche Glaubenslehre.* IV. 2. Guetersloh, 1870.
16. Wangemann. *Das Opfer nach d. h. Schrift, etc.* 2 Bde. Berlin, 1866.

See the various articles on this topic in the Lexicons of Herzog, Kitto, Riehm, Smith, and Winer.

10. OF SIN.

1. Mueller, Julius. *The Christian Doctrine of Sin.* Translated from the Fifth Edition of the German. 2 vols. Edinburgh, 1868. Sixth German Edition. 2 vols. Stuttgart 1877.
2. Philippi, F. A. *Die Lehre von der Suende.* In third volume of his "Kirchliche Glaubenslehre", pp. 1—250. Third edition. Guetersloh, 1884.

3. Tholuck, A. *Die Lehre von der Suende u. v. Versoehner*. 9th edition, 1870.
4. Tulloch, John. *The Christian Doctrine of Sin*. New York, (1876).
Compare works on Systematic Theology.

11. OF THE STATE AFTER DEATH.

1. Alger, Wm. R. *A Critical History of the Doctrine of a Future Life*. Tenth Edition. With a complete Bibliography by Ezra Abbot. Boston, 1878.
2. Boettcher. *De inferis rebusque post mortem futuris*. Dresden, 1846.
The literature of the subject up to the year 1844 is given in this learned work.
3. Cremer, H. *Beyond the Grave*. With an Introduction by A. A. Hodge, New York, 1886.
4. Goeschel, C. F. *Der Mensch nach Leib, Seele, und Geist, diesseits und jenseits*. Leipsic, 1856.
5. Humphrey, W. G. *The Doctrine of a Future State*. Hulsean Lectures for 1849. London, 1850.
6. Loescher, V. E. *Auserlesene Sammlung der besten und neueren Schriften vom Zustand der Seele nach dem Tode*. Dresden, 1735.
7. Luthardt, C. E. *Die Lehre v. d. letzten Dingen*. 3 Aufl. Leipsic, 1885.
8. Perowne, J. J. S. *Immortality*. Hulsean Lectures for 1868. London, 1869.
9. Rinck, H. W. *Vom Zustand nach dem Tode*. Second edition. Ludwigsburg and Basel, 1866.
10. Rudloff. *Die Lehre vom Menschen*, etc. Second edition. Gotha, 1863.
11. Spiess, Edm. *Entwicklungsgeschichte der Vorstellungen vom Zustande nach dem Tode*. Jena, 1877.
12. Whately, R. *View of the Scripture Revelations concerning a Future State*. London, 1870.
See also works on Biblical Psychology, on Eschatology, and on Systematic Theology.

12. OF THE TABERNACLE AND THE TEMPLE.

1. Atwater, E. E. *The Sacred Tabernacle of the Hebrews*. New York, 1875.
2. Bannister, J. T. *The Temples of the Hebrews*, etc. London, 1866.
3. Edersheim, Alfred. *The Temple*. Its Ministry and Services as they were in the time of Christ. London. No date.

4. Keil, C. F. *Der Tempel Solomo's*. Dorpat, 1839.
5. Riggenbach. *Die Mosaische Stiftshuette*. Second edition, 1867.

13. OF THE WISDOM LITERATURE.

1. *Job*. See the *Commentaries* of Cook, Cox, Davidson, Delitzsch, Dillmann and Zoeckler.
2. *Proverbs*. See the *Commentaries* of Delitzsch, Plumptre, and Zoeckler.
3. *Ecclesiastes*. See the *Commentaries* of Cox, Delitzsch, Ginsburg, Wright and Zoeckler.

INDEX.

Abaddon and death, 113—116
 Abel, 41
 Abraham, 45; trial of, 47—49, 166
Adonai, 66, 70
 Adultery, sin of, 146; trial of suspected, 147, 194, 195
 Ahab, 232
 Ahaz, 241, 242
 Altar, the, 159; meaning of, 161
 Amon, 243
 Amos, 235, 291
 Analogy of faith, 28
 Angel of the Lord, doctrine of, 88—91
 Angelology, Mosaic, 91, 92; prophetic, 256—258
 Angels, fall of, 39 n.; doctrine of, 256—258; office of, 257, 258; orders of, 258, 259; evil, 262
Anima and Animus, 102, 103
 Animal offerings, 168; ritual of, 171—174
 Anthropology, 98—111
 Anthropomorphisms, 74
 Anthropopathies, 77
 Apocalyptic literature, 252
 Ark of the Covenant, 159; meaning of, 162
 Athaliah, 240, 241
 Atonement, instrument of, 162, 173; day of, 162, 186; ritual of, 188—190; signification of, 191; vicarious, 192, 193
 Attributes of God, 69—77
 Auberlen, 31
 Augustine, 27, 123
 Avenging of blood, 150
Azazel, 188—190, 192, 262

Baal, 232
 Balaam and Balak, 58
Bara, 79
Bath-Kol, 87
 Beck, 31, 98
 Bellarmine, 29
 Bengel, 29
 Biblical Archæology, 19
 Biblical Introduction, 18
 Biblical Theology, see Theology of O. T.
 Bigamy, 100
 Blessing and curse, 129
 Blood, use made of, 136, 167, 172—174, 186, 187
 Blood revenge, 140, 150
 Body, soul and spirit, 101—104
 Böttcher, 112
 Book of the Law, 59n
 Bondage, in time of Patriarchs, 151; regulations concerning, 152
 Brazen serpent, 58
 Burnt-offering, 176, 177

Cainites, 40—42
 Canaan, occupation of, 60; land of, 60, 61
 Canaanites, 60
 Candlestick, the golden, 158; meaning of, 161
 Canon of Old Testament, 21, 22
 Cedar, 194
 Chance, 82, 83
Cherem, 60, 180
 Cherubim, form of the, 163, 164, 258
 Children, a blessing, 100; education of by parents, 147, 148
 Circumcision, historical origin

- of, 126; religious import of, 126, 127
 Compassion of God, 129
 Consciousness after death, 115
 Corporal punishment, 142
 Courts of Justice, 140, 141
 Covenant, the Divine, 117; the new, with Israel, 296, 297
 Creation, account of, 37, 38; doctrine of, 78, 79; design of 82
 Crusius on prophecy, 274
 Cuneiform inscriptions, 38
 Curse and blessing, 128
 Cuvier, 38
 Cyrus, 249

Dalman, 66
 Daniel, 248; book of, 265, 289; four kingdoms of, 293
 Darius, 250
 Dates in prophecy, 283
 David, reign of, 221; unites three theocratic dignities, 222; religious development of, 222; Psalms of, 223; form of worship under, 223
 Day of the Lord, the, 172
 Dead, kingdom of, 114—116
 Death, is the consequence of sin, 112; state of man after, 113—116, 324, 325; shall be destroyed, 299
 Decalogue, the, 123—125
 Dedication, feast of, 208
 Delitzsch, 31, 38, 98; on Satan, 40; on (Gen. 3: 15), 40; on sacrifice, 40, 41
 Demons, 71
 Deuteronomy, 58, 59
 Divination, prophecy differs from, 279
 Divine name, meaning of, 85, 86
 Divine voice, meaning of, 87
 Divorce, right of, 147
 Dreams, 96

 Ecclesiastes, stand-point of book of, 333, 334; moral teaching of book of, 334

 Egypt, Israel in, 53—56
El, 63, 64, 68
 Election of Israel, 118, 119
El-Elyon, 63, 64
 Elijah, 116, 232, 233
 Elisha, 116, 232, 233
Eloah, 63, 64
Elohim, 63—65, 68
 El-Shaddai, 63, 66
 Enoch, 41, 115, 116
 Esarhaddon, 237
 Esau, 50
 Eternity of God, 69
 Evil, origin of, 39; moral and physical, 83, 84
 Ewald, 30
 Exegesis, 20
 Exodus, book of, 54
 Ezekiel, 245, 246
 Ezra, administration of, 251

Faith, of Abraham, 47, 48; belongs to sphere of heart, 104; justification by, 267, 268; definition of, 267
 Faithfulness of God, 75, 76
 Fall, the, 39, 107
 Family inheritance, to be preserved, 149
 Fasting, 181
 Fatherhood of God, 118, 119
 Feasts of the Jews, 197
 Fermentation forbidden in offerings, 168, 169
 Flood, tradition of, 40—42
 Food-offering, ritual of, 168, 169, 175
 Free-will offering, 178

Gabler, 30
 Gabriel, 259
 Gedeliah, 247
 Glory, divine, 86, 87
 God, Mosaic idea of, 63; names of, 63, 64; attributes of, 69—77; eternity of, 69; immutability of, 69; unity of, 70; is life, 69, 70; universality of the idea of, 70n; Spirit of, 94, 95; holiness of, 71, 72; omnipres-

- ence of, 74; spirituality of, 74; righteousness of, 75; faithfulness of, 75, 76; jealousy of, 76, 77; relation of, to the world, 78, 79; meaning of name of, 85, 86; sight of, 96, 97; fatherhood of, 118, 119; countenance and glory of, 86, 87, 92; penal justice of, 129
- Guyot, 38
- Haggai**, 250
- Hævernicks, 31
- Ham, 44
- Hardening of heart, 84, 110
- Heart, and soul, 102, 103; man is characterized by his, 103; hardening of the, 84, 110
- Heathen, how related to the kingdom of God, 290; judgment upon, 292,—294; shall be admitted into the kingdom of God, 302—304
- Heaven, host of, 256—258
- Heiresses, laws concerning, 148
- Hengstenberg, 30; on prophecy, 275
- Herder, 30
- Hereditary sin, 109
- Hezekiah, 239, 242
- Hhakkamim* the, 228
- Htherem*, 60, 180
- Hhokhma*, see Wisdom
- High Priest, office, 136; consecration of, 136; makes atonement for himself, 189; meaning of dress of, 136
- History of O. T., 19, 20, Pentateuchal period, 37—61; times of the Judges, 211—215; of the undivided kingdom, 221—229; of the Ten Tribes, 230—238; of the kingdom of Judah, 239—247; of exilic and post-exilic times, 248—253
- Hofmann, 31
- Holiness of God, 71, 72, 73
- Holy Spirit, 94—96
- Holy Place, 158, 161
- Holy Place, Most, 159
- Horns of altar, 160
- Hosea, 235
- Hosts, God of, 254—258
- Human sacrifice, 166, 215
- Immortality, 106; doctrine of in book of Job, 331, 332; in book of Ecclesiastes, 333, 334
- Immutability of God, 69
- Incense, altar of, 158; meaning of, 161
- Incense, 170
- Inheritance, law of, 148, 149
- Innocence, state of, 105, 106
- Isaac, 50
- Isaiah, 240, 241, 243
- Israel in Egypt, 53—55
- Israel, election of, the free act of God's love, 118, 119; the servant of Jehovah, 121; judgment upon, 290, 291; restoration of, 295—298; new covenant with, 296, 297
- Jacob**, 50, 51
- Japheth, 44
- Jealousy of God, 76, 77
- Jehoahaz, 244
- Jehoiakim, 241
- Jehosaphat, 239, 240
- Jehovah*, pronunciation of, 66; signification of, 67; age and origin of name, 67; attributes derived from name, 69, 70; doctrine of Angel of, 88—91; *Sabaoth*, 254—258
- Jehu, 234; dynasty of, 234, 235
- Jephthah, narrative of, 214
- Jeremiah, 240, 244, 247
- Jeroboam I, reign of, 229, 230
- Jerusalem, destruction of, 246
- Jezebel, 232
- Joash, 241
- Job, lessons of the book of, 330
- Joel, 241, 291
- Jonah, 235
- Joseph, 52
- Joshua, 53—61
- Josiah, 239, 243

- Jotham, 241
 Jubilee, year of, 202; import of, 203
 Judah, history of kingdom of, 239—247; captivity of, 246
 Judge, office of, 211, 212
 Judges, times of, 211, 212; religious condition of times, 212—215
 Judgment, upon Israel, 290, 291; upon the heathen nations, 292—294
Jus talionis, 141
 Justice, the course of, 141, 142
 Justification by faith, 267, 268
Kadosh, 71, 72
 Kapporeth, the, 159; meaning of, 162
 Keil, 49
 King, law concerning a, 142, 143; consecration of, 220
 Kingdom of God, design of, 288, 289; how related to the heathen, 290
 Kurtz, 49, 123
Lamech, 41, 42
 Law and Gospel, 27, 28
 Law, the, 122; tables of, 123—125; ceremonial and moral, 264, 265
 Laying on of hands, in offerings, 186, 187, 191
 Leper, purification of the, 190
 Levirate Marriage, the, 149
 Levites, the, represent the people before Jehovah, 131; official functions of, 131; consecration of, 132, 133; social position of, 133; support of, 133, 183; during the times of the Judges, 213; service of, organized by David, 224
 Life, origin of, 79, 80
 Logos, the, 90
 Lord of Hosts, doctrine of, 254—258
 Lynch law forbidden, 140
Malakh Jehovah, doctrine of, 88—91
Malachi, 252; book of, 265
 Man, idea of, 98, 99; divine image of, 98, 99; relation to sex and race, 99, 100; unity of, 100; constituent parts of, 101, 102; primitive state of, 105, 106; sin in, 106—111; state of, after death, 113—116, 324, 325
 Manasseh, 243
 Marriage, 99; law of, 144; contract, 145; bars to, 145; dissolution of, 146; the Levirate, 148; teaching of the Proverbs, 325
 Megiddo, battle of, 244
 Melchizedek, 48, 49
 Menahem, 235
 Mercy seat, 159
 Messiah, the, promised in Genesis, 40; in the Pentateuch, 306; the son of man, 260; two-fold view of coming of, 305; idea of, defined, 306; development of idea of, 307, 308; office and work of, 309, 310; a suffering, 311; is the *Branch*, 309, 312
 Messianic Psalms, 306, 307
 Michael, 259
 Miracle, doctrine of, 93, 94; significance of, 232
 Monogamy, 100
 Monotheism, 54
 Mosaism, 33, 37; subjects discussed under, 62
 Moses, 53—59
 Murder, to be avenged, 150, 195
 Murphy, 38
Nabhi, 218
 Nahum, 245
 Name of God, 86
 Names of God, 63—69
 Naming of a child, 127
 Nations, register of, 44
 Nature, Old Testament view of, 319
 Nazaritism, 181, 182
 Nebuchadnezzar, 246
 Nehemiah, 251, 252
Nephesh, 101, 113

- New moon, 201
 New Testament, how related to Old, 25
 Nineveh, destruction of, 244
 Noah, 42, 43; covenant with, 43, 44
Oath, the, 141, 155
 Oehler, 32
 Offering, see Sacrifice; idea of, 165; pre-Mosaic, 40, 41, 43, 165, 166; material of the, 168—170; animal, 168; vegetable, 168, 169; burning of, 174; various kinds of, 176; burnt, 176; peace, 177—179
 Oil, 170
 Old Testament, how related to the New, 25
 Old Testament Theology, see Theology of O. T.
 Omnipresence of God, 74
 Omri, dynasty of, 232
 Original state of man, 105, 106
Paradise, 43
 Parents, relation of, to children, 147, 148
 Passover, laws concerning, 204, 205; significance of, 205, 206
 Patriarchs, history of, 47—52; the twelve, 51
 Peace-offering, name of, 177; three kinds of, 178; ritual, 178; signification of, 179, 180
 Pentateuch, divisions of sacred history of, 37; messianic idea in, 306
 Pentecost, significance of, 207
 Perjury, 156
 Personality of God, 69
 Perspective of prophecy, 283
 Pharaoh, 110
 Philosophy of the Hebrews, 315
 Picturing God, wrong, 73, 74
 Piepenbring, 31
 Plagues, 54, 128
 Poetry, Hebrew, 227
 Polygamy, 100, 145
 Prediction, a characteristic of prophecy, 281, 282
 Pre-existence of the soul, 102
 Preservation of the world, 80, 81
 Priests, calling of the, 134; consecration of, 134, 135; maintenance of, 136
 Primeval Age, history of, 37—42
 Primitive state of man, 105, 106
 Prophecy, nature of, 270—280; psychological definition in ancient times, 272; office of prophecy, 281; in older Protestant Theology, 273, 274; an inward intuition, 276; illustrated by analogies, 278; differs from divination, 279; prediction an element of, 281, 282; peculiarities of, 282—284; fulfilment of, 284—287; how interpreted, 304
 Prophet, definition of, 218, 270
 Prophets, schools of, 218, 219, 233
 Prophetic office, nature of, 217; object of, 218, 233; close of, 252
 Prophetism, 33, 254
 Proverbs, the ethics of Book of, 322, 323; the family, 325; the state, 326
 Providence, divine, 82—84, 319, 331
 Psalms, Elohistic, 68n; the Messianic, 306, 307; imprecatory, 328
 Pul, 235
 Punishment, the course of, 141, 142; principle of, 141; corporal, 142; vicarious, 192, 193
 Purification, means of, 193; acts of, 193, 194
 Purifications, Levitical, 193, 194
 Purim, feast of, 208
Race, unity of, 100
 Rechabites, the, 234
 Redemption, the future, 298,

- 299, the restoration of Israel, 295—298; the reunion of the twelve tribes, 298; admission of the heathen, 302—304
- Rehoboam, 229, 240
- Remnant of Jacob, the, 295, 296
- Restoration of Israel, 295—298
- Resurrection, doctrine of, 300, 301
- Retribution, the Divine, 128, 129, 239; doctrine of, 327, 333
- Revelation, biblical idea of, 18, 23; doctrine of, 85; general and special, 23, 85; historical progress of, 24, 25; organs of, 96, 97; and prophecy, 273, 274
- Riehm, 31
- Righteousness of God, 75; of man, 111
- Ruach*, 101; *Elohim*, 94, 95
- Sabbath**, antiquity of, 198; origin of, 198; idea of, 199; celebration of, 200; of new moon, 201
- Sabbatical year, laws concerning, 202; import of, 203
- Sabaoth*, *Jehovah*, 254—258
- Sacred seasons, times of, 196; celebration of, 197
- Sacrifice, nature of first, 40, 41, 43; Pre-Mosaic, 165; meaning of, 154, 165; material of, 168—170; ritual of, 171—174; atoning, 188—192; passover, 205, 206; prophecies concerning, how interpreted, 304
- Salvation, O. T. experience of, 268
- Samaritans, origin of, 237; enmity of, 249
- Samuel, 216
- Sanctuary, arrangement of, 158; meaning of, 159; utensils of, 160; rooms of, 161
- Satan, doctrine of, 40, 260—262
- Saul, reign of, 221
- Sargon, 236
- Sayce, 38
- Schlottman, 32
- Schultz, 31
- Schools of the prophets, 218, 219, 233
- Scribes, the, 252
- Seasons, see Sacred seasons
- Sennacherib, 242
- Seraphim, 258
- Servant of Jehovah, 121, 310
- Servants, 151, 152
- Sethites, 40—42
- Seven, the number, 197
- Sex and race, 99
- Shallum, 235
- Shalmanezar, 236
- Shem, 44
- Sheol*, O. T. conception of, 114—116, 324
- Shekhina*, the, 92, 93
- Shewbread, table of, 161
- Sin, origin of, 39, 83, 84; God permits, 83, 84; formal and material principle of, 106, 107; O. T. names for, 107, 108; as an inclination, 108; hereditary, 108, 109; degrees, 109, 110; connection with death, 112; ruinous nature of, 265, 266; guilt of, 266
- Sin-offering, 184; ritual of, 185, 186
- Sinai, Israel at, 56, 57
- Slavery, 151, 152
- Sodom and Gomorrah, 44
- Solomon, reign of, 225; dark sides of reign of, 228
- Sons of God, 91
- Sopherim, 149
- Soul, related to body and spirit, 101—104; origin of, 113; state of, after death, 113—116
- Spener, 29
- Spirit of God, 94—96
- Spirit, connection with body and soul, 101—104
- Spirituality of God, 74
- State, the, 326
- Stier, 32

- Suffering, four-fold purpose of human, 330
 Swearing, 155
 Synagogue, the great, 252
 Synagogues, 248
 Systematic Theology, 20, 21
- T**abernacle, 158—161; during the times of the Judges, 213
 Tabernacles, feast of, 207, 208
 Taxes, the theocratic, 183
 Temple, building of the, 225; significance and dedication of, 226; rebuilding of, 250
 Ten commandments, 123; division of, 123, 124; how divided between the two tables, 125
 Ten tribes, the kingdom of, 230—238; captivity of, 236
 Tent of testimony, 158—161
 Theology of Old Testament, definition, 17; how related to other disciplines, 18; sources, 20; scientific stand-point of, 22; history of cultivation of, 26—31; divisions of, 33; literature of, 30
 Tiglath-Pileser, 236
 Tithes, 183
 Trespass-offering, 184; ritual of, 185
 Trial of Abraham, 49
 Trichotomy of man, 101, 102
 Trinity, doctrine of, 95 n
 Truth of God, 74
Tsaddig, 75
- Unchangeableness of God, 69, 70
 Uncleaness, 194
 Unity of God, 70, 71
 Unity of race, 100
- Urim and Thummim, 139, 140
 Uzziah, 241
- V**egetable offerings, 168, 169
 Vicarious atonement, 192, 193
 Visions, 96
 Voice, divine, 87
 Vows, 180: three kinds of, 180, 181
- W**alsh, 38
 Washing-basin, 161
 Waving, 179
 Weeks, feast of, 207
 Wife, 144—147
 Wilderness, wanderings in, 55—58
 Wisdom, Old Testament, province of, 228, 315; a special department of knowledge, 315—317; objective principle of, 318—320; subjective principle of, 321, 322; an attribute of God, 318; personified, 318; controls human affairs, 319, 320
 Woman, 144—177
 Word of God, in worship, 155
 World, creation of, 37, 38, 78, 79; preservation of, 80, 81
 Worship, essential character of, 154; place of, 157, acts of, 165; prophecies, concerning temple, how interpreted, 304
- X**erxes, 251
- Y**ahwe, see Jehovah
- Z**achariah, 235
 Zeal of God, 76, 77
 Zedekiah, 246
 Zephaniah, 244
 Zerubbabel, 249

1 1012 01145 2036

Date Due

2. *Spizella monticola*

4 2 2 4

Ja 28 '48

AP 9 '53

DE 13'54

JE 3 '55

1901-1902



